

P F
4133
H53
1902
MAIN

UC-NRLF



B 4 082 072

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

Johns Hopkins Univ

Class

~~851~~
~~H/631~~





Strengthening Modifiers of Adjectives and Adverbs in Middle High German

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY,

BY

FRED COLE HICKS.



BALTIMORE:

JOHN MURPHY COMPANY,

1902.

PF4133
H53
1902
MAIN

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
PREFATORY.....	5
SOURCES AND TEXTS.....	7
INTRODUCTION.....	12
VIL.....	15
HARTE.....	28
GAR.....	49
WOL.....	57
REHTE.....	63
GENUOC.....	69
SÈRE.....	74
STARKE.....	76
AL.....	77
MICHEL.....	78
GRIMME.....	78
STRENGTHENING PARTICLES WITH COMPARATIVES.....	79
SUMMARY BY DIALECTS.....	81
STRENGTHENING PARTICLES IN THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF LITERATURE.....	82
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	87



STRENGTHENING MODIFIERS OF ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS IN MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN.

PREFATORY.

In the following pages a study of the use of strengthening modifiers of adjectives and adverbs during the classical Middle High German period, or from about 1150 to 1300, is attempted. Such devices being so largely unconscious, and at the same time so subject to fashion, we may expect to find a certain consistency in their use, and to see in them marks of style, sometimes of the individual, but more often of different schools and classes of literature. They seem therefore well worthy of special treatment.

Aside from the thesis of H. Z. Kip,¹ which is limited to the religious poetry of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and which treats the subject more from the standpoint of the lexicographer, no such treatment has been given. What little has been done on the subject is to be found in the dictionaries, and scattered through the notes in the various editions of the works of this period. That the material there offered is inadequate, and the statement of facts often erroneous, is apparent to one who takes but a casual glance into the subject, or who will but compare the notes of the different editors.

During the investigation which has formed the basis of this study, such questions as the following have been kept in mind, in the case of each of the words which may be classed as strengthening particles, viz: 1. The origin and development of meaning of the word. 2. In what dialects and for what periods is it current? 3. In what classes of literature is it found, or in what classes is it the most frequent? 4. With what classes of adjectives and adverbs is it used? 5. Is it a

¹Zur Geschichte der Steigerungsadverbien in der deutschen geistlichen Dichtung des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts, (Leipzig Dissertation) Journ. of Germ. Phil., vol. III, p. 143 ff.

part of the popular dialect, or is it confined to literary or poetical diction? 6. Are there any signs of its becoming obsolete? 7. The peculiarities of individual writers, if any.

Not all of the literature of this period has been examined, as that seemed neither necessary nor feasible. The works which were selected for exhaustive treatment, however, are such as may be considered fairly representative of the different classes of literature during the period, and are numerous enough to warrant the drawing of general conclusions.

For the purpose of statistics, the different forms of the same word to which a strengthening particle is joined (as for instance, *nā*, *nāch*, *nāhe*, *nāhen*) are grouped together, and no distinction is made between the adjective and the adverbial use of the same word. This plan has been adopted on the assumption that the choice of a strengthening particle with any author is not dependent on the form or grammatical use of the word to be strengthened. In the examples which are given, the more usual form of the word, and in the case of adjectives, the uninflected form, appears. No attempt has been made to preserve the orthography of the different editions, except where direct citations are made.

SOURCES AND TEXTS.

The following works have served as sources. They are arranged under the different dialects, as far as may be determined, in chronological order, the classification and dating being that of the various editors, Paul's *Grundriss*, and Michels' *Mittelhochdeutsches Elementarbuch*. The works have been examined exhaustively, except as may be indicated for some of the longer ones.¹

ALEMANNIC.

1. Poetical monuments.

a) Lower Alemannic.

Reinmar von Hagenau, *Des Minnesangsfrühling*, p. 150 ff.
Gottfried von Strassburg, *Tristan*, ed. by Bechstein, Leipzig 1890.

Konrad Fleck, *Flore und Blanscheflur*, ed. by Emil Sommer, Quedlinburg 1846.

Die Gute Frau, ed. by the same, *ZfdA* 2, 385 ff.

Volmar, *Das Steinbuch*, ed. by Lambel, Heilbronn 1877.

Konrad von Würzburg,

Der Trojanische Krieg (10,000), ed. by A. von Keller, Stuttgart, 1858.

Keiser Otte mit dem Barte, ed. by K. A. Hahn, Quedlinb.-Leipzig 1838.

Alexius, ed. by Richard Henczynski, Berlin 1898.

Hugo von Langenstein, *Martina* (10,000), ed. by A. von Keller, Stuttgart 1856.

Reinfried von Braunschweig (10,000), ed. by Bartsch, Stuttgart 1871.

Peter von Stauffenberg, ed. by Edw. Schröder, *Zwei Altdeutsche Rittermaeren*, Berlin 1894.

b) Upper Alemannic.

Rudolf von Ems,

Der Gute Gerhard, ed. by Haupt, Leipzig 1840.

¹ The figures in parentheses after any title indicate the number of lines of that particular monument which have been considered.

8 *Strengthening Modifiers in Middle High German.*

Barlaam und Josaphat (10,000), ed. by Pfeiffer, Leipzig 1843.

Johannes Hadlaub, ed. by Bartsch, Biblioth. Aelterer Schriftwerke der deutschen Schweiz, vol. VI, 283 ff.

2. Prose.

Altdeutsche Predigten, ed. by Wackernagel, (sermons 1-13, 18-20, 27-35, 42-52) Basel 1876.

Predigten des 13. Jahrhunderts, ed. by Grieshaber (100 pages), Stuttgart 1844-46.

Predigt auf Johannes den Täufer, Germania, 35.

BAVARIAN-AUSTRIAN.

1. Poetical monuments.

a) Bavarian.

Albrecht von Johansdorf, MF XII.

Wolfdietrich B, bearbeitet von Oskar Jänicke, Deutsches Heldenbuch, vol. III, Berlin 1871.

Wolfram von Eschenbach, Parzival, ed. by Lachmann, Berlin 1891.

Neidhart von Reuenthal, ed. by Haupt, Leipzig 1858.

Wernher der Gartenaere, Helmbrecht, ed. by Keinz, Leipzig 1887.

Die Warnung, ed. by Haupt, ZfdA 1, 438 ff.

Lamprecht von Regensburg, S. Franciskens Leben, ed. by Weinhold, Paderborn 1880.

Reinbot von Durne, Der Heilige Georg, ed. by F. Vetter, Halle 1896.

Der Jüngere Titarel (2800), ed. by K. A. Hahn, Quedlinburg 1842.

Lohengrin (5000), ed. by Rückert, Quedlinb.-Leipzig 1858.

b) Austrian.

Die Hochzeit, ed. by Waag, Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des XI. und XII. Jahrhunderts, Halle 1890.

Genesis und Exodus, nach der Milstätter Handschrift, ed. by J. Diemer, Vienna 1862.

Die Bücher Mosis, ed. by the same, Deutsche Gedichte des XI. und XII. Jahrhunderts.

- Entierist, ed. by Hoffmann, *Fundgruben* II, 102 ff.
Konrad von Fussesbrunn, *Kindheit Jesu*, ed. by Kochen-
dörffer, *Quellen und Forschungen*, 43.
Der Nibelunge Nôt¹ (with reference to versions A, B, and C),
ed. by Bartsch, Leipzig 1870–80.
Biterolf und Dietleib, ed. by Jänicke, DHB vol. I.
Ortnit, ed. by Amelung and Jänicke, DHB vol. III.
Wolfdietrich A and C, by the same.
Kudrun, ed. by B. Symons, Halle 1883.
Walther von der Vogelweide,² ed. by Lachmann, Berlin
1891.
Der Stricker, Karl der Grosse (10,000), ed. by Bartsch,
Quedlinburg 1857.
Freidank, Bescheidenheit, ed. by Bezzenberger, Halle 1872.
Heinrich von dem Türlin, *Diu Krone* (10,000), ed. by
Scholl, Stuttgart 1852.
Ulrich von Lichtenstein (7285), ed. by Lachmann, Berlin
1841.
Der Pleier, Garel von dem blühenden Tal (10,000), ed. by
Walz, Freiburg 1892.
Friedrich von Sonnenburg, ed. by Zingerle, Innsbruck 1878.
Ulrich von Eschenbach, Alexander (10,000), ed. by Wen-
delin Toischer, Tübingen 1888.

2. Prose.

- Berthold von Regensburg (vol. 1, 155 pp., vol. 2, 53 pp.),
ed. by Pfeiffer and Strobl, Vienna 1862–80.
Altdeutsche Predigten, Wackernagel, (sermons 21–26).
Altdeutsche Predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St. Paulus,
ed. by A. Jeitteles.

SWABIAN.

- Wernhers Maria, *Fundgruben* II, 145 ff.
Meinloh von Söflingen, MF II.
Bernger von Horheim, MF XIV.
Heinrich von Rugge, MF XIII.

¹The dictionary of this edition was used for statistics as to strengthening particles.

²Hornig's Glossar zu Walth. was used for data.

10 *Strengthening Modifiers in Middle High German.*

Hartmann von Aue,¹

Lyrics, MF XXI.

Erec, ed. by Haupt, Leipzig 1871.

Erstes Büchlein,² ed. by Bech, Leipzig 1871-3.

Gregorius, ed. by Paul, Halle 1882.

Der Arme Heinrich, ed. by the same.

Iwein,³ ed. by Henrici, Halle 1891.

Zweites Büchlein,⁴ ed. by Bech, as above.

Gottfried von Neifen, ed. by Haupt, Leipzig 1851.

Ulrich Schenk von Winterstetten, ed. by Minor, Vienna 1882.

Der Marner, ed. by Strauch, QuF 14.

Der Rosengarten A, ed. by Georg Holz, Halle 1893.

Wolfdietrich D, ed. by Amelung and Jänicke, DHB vol. 4.

Prose.

Bruder David von Augsburg, ed. by Pfeiffer ZfdA 9.

EAST FRANKISH.

Konrad von Heimesfurt, Himmelfahrt Mariae, ed. by Pfeiffer,
ZfdA 8, 156 ff.

Wirnt von Gravenberg, Wigalois, der Ritter mit dem Rade
(10,000), ed. by Benecke, Berlin 1819.

Der Winsbeke and Die Winsbekin, ed. by Leitzmann, Halle
1888.

Hugo von Trimberg, Der Renner (5000), herausgegeben vom
historischen Verein in Bamberg, 1833.

SOUTH FRANKISH.

Moriz von Craon, ed. by Schröder, Zwei altdeutsche Ritter-
maeren, Berlin 1894.

Reinmar von Zweter, ed. by Gustav Roethe, Leipzig 1887.

¹ Vos, Diction and Rime-Technic of Hartman von Aue, was referred to for verification of data for Hartmann.

² For the Büchlein the edition of Haupt-Martin, Leipzig 1881 was compared.

³ The dictionary of Benecke-Wilken was used for data for Iwein.

⁴ The study of strengthening particles has brought to light no difference of diction which would warrant excluding the Zw. Büchl. from the works of Hartmann. For points of similarity see under *Starke*, p. 76; *Verre*, p. 80; and *Wol*, p. 63.

WEST MIDDLE GERMAN.

a) Moselfrankish.

- Vorau Alexander, ed. by Kinzel, Halle 1884.
Das Rolandslied, ed. by Bartsch, Leipzig, 1874.
König Rother, ed. by K. von Bahder, Halle, 1884.
Orendel, ed. by Arnold E. Berger, Bonn 1888.
Strassburg Alexander, ed. by Kinzel as above.
Sanct Brandan, ed. by Carl Schröder, Erlangen 1871.

b) Rhinefrankish.

- Friedrich von Hausen, ed. by Lachmann-Haupt, MF p. 42 ff.

c) Hessian.

- Athis und Prophlias, ed. by W. Grimm, Kl. Schr. 3, 212 ff.
Herbort von Fritslar, Liet von Troye, ed. by Frommann,
Quedlinb.-Leip. 1837.
Die Erlösung, ed. by Bartsch, Quedlinb.-Leip. 1858.
Elisabeth, ed. by Rieger, Stuttgart.

THURINGIAN.

a) Poetical monuments.

- Heinrich von Morungen, MF p. 122 ff.
Ebernand von Erfurt, Heinrich und Kunigunde, ed. by
Bechstein, Quedlinb.-Leip. 1860.
Heinrich von Kröllwitz, Das Vater Unser, ed. by Lisch,
Quedlinb.-Leip. 1839.
Der Sünden Widerstreit, ed. by Zeidler, Graz 1892.
Heinrich von Meissen, ed. by Ettmüller, Quedlinb.-Leip.
1843.
Heinrich von Freiberg, Tristan Fortsetzung, ed. by von
der Hagen, Gottfrieds von Strassburg Werke, Breslau
1823.

b) Prose.

- Sermons of Eckard, Wackernagel, Altdeutsche Predigten,
55, 56, 60, 61.

INTRODUCTION.

In the German language of all periods, there has been a class of words, usually the most common adverbs, which in addition to their usual office have assumed the special function of serving as strengtheners of adjectives and other adverbs. This special function may amount in some cases to an entirely new use of the word, from which the original meaning or color has been wholly obliterated. Compare for example Modern German *sehr*, or Middle High German *vil*. In others, some trace of the original force of the words may be retained, as in Mod. Germ. *gar* or *recht*, MHG *harte*. To this class of words in general the term strengthening modifier, or strengthening particle may be applied.

All such usage is in origin metaphorical. A word standing for a definite adverbial notion is applied to an adjective or an adverb for the purpose of emphasizing the quality which it expresses; in other words, the attribute of one class of ideas is asserted of another. If it is applied often enough, so that we forget that the strengthening word has any special significance of its own, the figure loses its force, or color, and the result is a faded metaphor. Strengthening particles then, as applied to the words they modify, are examples of faded metaphors.

With some of these strengthening adverbs in Mod. Germ., the metaphorical nature of the figure is more apparent than with others. This means simply that the original force of the word has been retained longer in some particles than in others. The same is true for the MHG period, or indeed for any period of the language. The reason for this lies in the fact that the word survives in the language in some other usage, and this it is that measures the real strength of the particle. It is necessary that the original meaning of the word, as preserved in some other usage, be present to the mind, in order that the force of the implied comparison be felt. Mod. Germ. *gar* and *recht* are two words which have retained their freshness and force as strengthening particles for many centuries simply because they have continued current also as adjectives and adverbs of manner.

Compare *gar* in *Das Brot ist nicht gar*, and in *gar schön, recht in recht froh*, and *recht* as a simple adjective. Such expressions as these are pleasing figures because the aptness of the comparison is at once felt.

An example of a particle with persistent individual force is to be found in MHG *sêre*, which retained for the most part during the whole period, as likewise in OHG, the notion which was associated with the noun *das sér*. The same is true of English *sore*, which had a limited use as a strengthening particle.¹ *Harte* is a similar word. Its connection with *harte* the adverb of manner, and *hart* the adjective, colored its meaning, and made it a very emphatic particle whenever it was used as a strengthener.

In all such cases where a word performs a double function, and serves both as a general strengthening particle and as an adverb of manner, it is but natural that in the course of time it should become obsolete in one or the other of these uses. In the case of *sêre*, the original meaning has in Mod. Germ. completely disappeared, and the word survives only as an indefinite strengthening particle. *Harte*, on the other hand, has been lost as a strengthening particle, except in a few isolated expressions, as *hart an*, *hart hinter*, etc., and remains as an adverb of manner and as an adjective.

From their very nature, it is evident that all those words which should be classed as strengthening particles, must be capable of general application to adjectives and adverbs, and recognizedly so. Their use must extend over a larger field than that of particular instances. It is of little importance stylistically if a writer or speaker uses on a particular occasion a certain word to strengthen the meaning of an adverb, as for example, in the following: *wir sîn geschart sô kreftec wol*, Lohengrin 4844. In such a case we assume that the author uses the expression intentionally, to produce a certain desired effect. If, however, he uses the word in this way so often that he begins to do it unconsciously, and if he applies it to a large number of adverbs whose meaning he wishes to emphasize, then we cease to take it at its face value, and the word is weakened to a mere indefinite strengthening particle.

¹And they were sore afraid. Luke 2:9.

Indefiniteness of meaning is then another mark of the strengthening particle. For the purpose of accurate classification, we shall have to exclude many words, and a few uses of some others, which are commonly considered as strengtheners of adjectives and adverbs. The strengthening of an adverbial or any other notion carries with it the assumption that the notion is capable of different degrees of intensity. The word to which a strengthening particle is joined must be one expressing an idea which is not absolute in its nature, or, expressing an absolute notion, it must be one used with weakened force. Such particles as *gar*, *ganz*, *al*, *dráto*, *alzoges*, etc., joined to adjectives or adverbs denoting an absolute quality do not come within our definition. Such expressions as *gar éne*, *al éine*, *al ze mál*, while in a certain loose sense they may be said to be stronger than the same adjectives would be without the modifiers, are not really strengthened by the particles. The qualities expressed by *éne*, *éine*, etc., mean no more than before, the limits within which they apply are only extended. If, however, we substitute for *éine* instead of the notion *loneness* the feeling of being alone, or *loneliness*, we have at once an idea capable of different degrees of intensity. *Vil éine*, or *gar éine*, then in this sense, are properly examples of strengthening particles. It is evident that all such adverbs as *gar*, *ganz*, *al*, having the idea of *completeness* rather than *to a high degree*, when applied to adjectives or adverbs expressing an absolute quality are used in their real not in their figurative sense.

There are a number of particles which have become so closely connected with the words they modify as to be considered inseparable parts of the expression or compound word. They are usually then written together with the words they modify. Examples of these in Mod. Germ. are *allein*, *als*, *also*, *alsbald*, *vielleicht*, *wohlan*, *wohlaufl*, *wohlfeil*. In MHG we may class under this head such words as *alterseine*, *borlanc*, *borgrôz*, *mâregrôz*, *uralt*, *urmâre*, *ubarlút*. Such categories as these are not included in the present discussion.

There are also a number of other adverbs which are occasionally found as modifiers of adjectives and adverbs, but the original meaning of the words is so evident that they are likewise

not included in the list of strengthening particles. They are such as the following: *billiche wären sie gemeit*, Elis. 459; *gar wirdeclichen schöne*, Elis. 397; *zuchtlichen frô*, Erl. 813; *sô wunneclichen werde*, Sünd. Wid. 3106; *grôzliche vil*, Karl der Gr. 3057; *alsô kreftecliche grôz*, Karl der Gr. 7992; *gar grimmeclichen kalt*, Krone 5440; *sô kreftec wol*, Loh. 4844; *innecliche leit*, Tristan 13,600; *wundern schöne*, Gen. 5-35; *tugentlichen frô*, Erl. 942; *sô vreislichen snel*, Wig. 164-10.

The words whose use in Middle High German as strengthening particles is considered in the following pages are: **vil**, **harte**, **gar**, **rechte**, **wol**, **genuoc**, **sêre**, **micheel**, **starke**, **al**, and **grimme**.

In the statistics under the different particles, and in the examples given, instances with the comparative are not included. These will be found discussed in a special chapter at the end.

VIL.

The commonest of all the strengthening particles during the MHG period, as likewise for OHG, is *vil*. The reason for this popularity lies doubtless in the fact that the word had lost its individual color very early, and was thus free to be joined with any and all classes of adjectives and adverbs. Etymologically *vil*, OHG *filu*, is connected with Latin *pollere*, *to be strong*, and the word may be considered as an undeclined neuter, either nominative or accusative as the case may be, of the adjective *filus*, which has been lost. As used adverbially, including the strengthening particle, *vil* appears as accusative of measure or degree.

Just what the original force of the Germanic root was, whether it had reference primarily to quantity or to number, is difficult to determine. Probably it was the former. During the early MHG period this particle was especially common with such words as *manec*, *selten*, *dicke*, *ofte*, etc., where the idea of number is involved. In Otfrid the preference of *filu* for the same class of words is just as marked. There is little doubt that in such expressions as *filu manag*, etc., as originally used, the figure was

felt as a real metaphor. This would hardly be true if the idea at the basis of the particle were likewise that of number.

The tables which are given below, in connection with the detailed treatment of this particle by dialects, will show that *vil* maintained its supremacy over the greater part of the MHG field down to the close of the thirteenth century. The actual frequency of the word in the various monuments varies greatly. The extent to which strengthening particles in general are used is a matter largely of individual taste and habit. There are differences, however, which are due to the nature of the literary material and to the particular branch of literature in question. Epic poetry, for instance, seems to offer the greatest opportunity for their use, and this is true more particularly for the popular and decadent court epic than for the court epic proper. In the popular epic they are employed to enliven the action, already the most important feature, and to give zest to the description. Lyric poetry, on the other hand, especially the more elevated in tone, is not marked by the presence of such expressions to so great an extent. In the religious prose there are great differences of usage, and these are to be ascribed partly to individual taste, partly no doubt to the peculiar usage of the class of society and the locality for which the work is written.

The difference in the relative frequency of *vil* in the various monuments, as compared with other particles, is very great even before any general decline in the use of this particle is noticeable. This is of course due to the varying frequency with which other particles appear, and the conditions regarding these are very complex. As will appear further on, the declining use of *harte*, *wol*, and *genuoc*, the increasing popularity of *gar*, the varying use of *rehte*, and the sporadic and purely local appearance of *sêre*, *starke* and *grimme*, all enter into consideration and modify the table of percentages for *vil*.

By the close of the thirteenth century, the decline in the use of *vil* is apparent over the whole territory. In certain parts of the field, as West Middle German, and in certain classes of literature, as lyric poetry and the prose monuments, the decline begins earlier and is more decided.

Statistics as to the frequency of *vil* in the various monuments

of the period are given in the following tables, which show the total number of strengthening particles found, the number of examples of *vil*, the number per thousand lines, and the ratio of *vil* to the whole number of particles, expressed in per cent. In each of the tables the lyrical monuments are indented.

To show how the periods of popularity of the various strengthening particles overlap one another, the percentages for *harte* and *gar* are repeated in the tables for *vil*.

ALEMANNIC.

	Total.	<i>Vil.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil.</i>	Per cent. <i>harte.</i>	Per cent. <i>gar.</i>
1. Poetical monuments.						
a) Lower Alemannic.						
Reinmar von Hagenau....	88	69	33	78	2	2
Tristan.....	412	257	13	62	13	...
Flore und Blanscheflur.....	82	54	7	66	22	6
Die Gute Frau.....	86	51	16	59	28	6
Das Steinbuch.....	27	14	14	58	22	...
Der Trojanische Krieg.....	351	257	26	73	4	8
Keiser Otte mit dem Barte...	22	14	18	82	10	9
Alexius.....	110	95	67	86	6	6
Martina.....	268	217	22	81	6	7
Reinfried von Braunschweig,	97	70	7	71	...	21
Peter von Stauffenberg.....	46	34	30	74	4	15
b) Upper Alemannic.						
Der Gute Gerhard.....	218	197	28	92	1	3
Barlaam und Josaphat.....	304	287	28	91	1	3
Johannes Hadlaub.....	106	53	23	50	...	35
2. Prose.						
Altd. Pred. Wack. 1-13, 18-20,	25	25	...	100
" " " 27-35,	26	24	...	93
" " " 42-52,	26	16	...	58	15	15
Deut. Pred. d. 13.						
Jahr., Griesh.....	53	9	...	17	2	68
Pred. auf Joh. d.						
Täufer, Germ. 35...	3	1	...	33	...	66

From the above tables for Alemannic, it will be seen that *vil* continues as the most common strengthening particle throughout the whole period. In Lower Alemannic monuments, while the percentages are by no means regular, no signs of a general decline in the use of this particle are to be seen. The actual

frequency varies from 7 to 67 examples per thousand lines. The work showing the lowest percentage is *Das Steinbuch*, which is popular in tone. Here the low percentage is caused by the frequency of *harte* and *rehte*.¹ The highest percentage for *vil*, as well as the greatest number of strengthening particles, is found in *Alexius*. This is largely due to the nature of the material. *Alexius*, like *Hartmann's Gregorius*, is a story with little description but full of strong situations and pathetic incidents, and therefore offers more scope for emphatic expressions.

The two Upper Alemannic monuments from the early part of the thirteenth century, the works of *Rudolph von Ems*, show few other strengthening particles, and consequently a high percentage for *vil*, 91 and 92. The lyric poems of *Johannes Hadlaub*, from the end of the century, show a decided decline in the percentage of *vil*, which is here 50, and a corresponding increase in the use of *gar*, which shows a percentage of 35.

The first three groups of sermons from *Wackernagel's* edition, which are from the twelfth or the early thirteenth century, show high percentages for *vil*. Sermons 42-52 which *Wackernagel* is inclined to place about 1300 (p. 268), show a somewhat lower percentage for *vil*, or 58. The presence of *harte* and the low percentage for *gar*, 15, indicate that this group is probably to be placed much earlier than 1300, at least in the first half of the thirteenth century.

While the lyric poems of *Johannes Hadlaub* show a low percentage for *vil*, there is no indication that even in Upper Alemannic *vil* is as yet becoming obsolete. Poetic diction would doubtless retain a word of this kind long after it had ceased to be current in the spoken language or in the prose literature. It would, however, remain longest in connection with the more common adjectives and adverbs and in formal expressions. Compare *Mod. Germ. vielleicht, Vielliebchen*. With such it would have the closest connection. If *vil* at the end of the thirteenth century were on the point of becoming obsolete, we should

¹ This is also largely a matter of editing. The manuscripts are all from the fifteenth century and show considerable variation as to strengthening particles. H. (*Hamburger*) occasionally substitutes *gar* for *vil* or *harte*. Dr. (*Erfurter Druck*) shows a higher per cent for *harte*.

expect to find its use limited, even in poetic diction, to these more common connections. The examples from Peter von Stauffenberg (1310), and Johannes Hadlaub (1302), do not indicate that such is the case. *Vil* is found here not only in the more frequent associations, such as *vil balde*, *vil dicke*, *vil gerne*, *vil guot*, *vil liep*, *vil manec*, *vil schæne*, *vil wol*, etc., but also in those which are not so common: *vil ange*, *vil lôs*, *vil siech*, *vil tump*, *vil valsch*, *vil genôte*, *vil zuchteclîche*. This shows that *vil* is still felt as a living element in the language, capable of use in new surroundings and of general application as a strengthener of adjectives and adverbs. The very frequent use of *vil* in the sermon literature (Wackernagel) for the thirteenth century shows also that it still remained current.

The low percentage for *vil* (17) in the volume of Grieshaber's *deutsche Predigten*, and the high percentage for *gar* (68) probably indicate that these are to be dated as late as the fourteenth century.¹ *Vil* here is limited to such common expressions as *vil lützel*, *vil manec*, *vil sêre*, *vil swære*, *vil übel*, *vil unreht*.

BAVARIAN-AUSTRIAN.

	Total.	<i>Vil.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil.</i>	Per cent. <i>harte.</i>	Per cent. <i>gar.</i>
Bavarian.						
a) Poetical monuments.						
Albrecht von Johanssdorf,	13	12	...	92	...	8
Wolfdietrich B.....	235	228	62	98	...	3
Parzival.....	293	186	7	63	14	2
Neidhart von Reuenthal,	93	81	24	87	4	4
Helmbrecht.....	46	45	25	98	2	...
Die Warnung (?).....	83	78	21	94	4	2
S. Franciscan Leben.....	109	75	15	69	10	10
Der Heilige Georg (?).....	86	68	11	79	10	7
Der Jüngere Titrel (?).....	154	136	49	88	...	11
Lohengrin.....	90	44	9	49	2	39
b) Prose.						
Berthold von Regensburg....	366	91	33	24	...	73

¹ Compare Richard Sensche, "Ueber den Stil bei dem alemannischen anonymen Prediger aus dem XIII. Jahrhundert." Berlin 1897. "Grieshabers deutsche Predigten sind aus sprachlichen Gründen dem XIV. Jahrhundert zuzuweisen."

	Total.	<i>vil.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil.</i>	Per cent. <i>harte.</i>	Per cent. <i>gar.</i>
2. Austrian.						
a) Poetical monuments.						
Die Hochzeit.....	37	34	31	92	8	...
Genesis.....	159	148	...	93	1	...
Exodus.....	156	148	94	94	4	...
Die Bücher Mosis.....	177	168	31	94	4	...
Enticrist.....	53	49	40	93	2	4
Kindheit Jesu.....	83	62	21	75	13	1
Nibelungen A ¹	1250	1000	100	82	8	...
“ B.....	1250	975	100	80	7	...
“ C.....	1250	900	92	75	7	...
Biterolf und Dietleib.....	701	636	47	90	6	...
Ortnit.....	126	101	42	80	17	1
Wolfdietrich A.....	250	224	90	90	7	...
Ortnit and Wolfdietrich C..	46	40	...	87	6	2
Kudrun.....	552	444	65	80	11	...
Walther v. d. Vogelweide,	145	123	26	85	1	7
Karl der Grosse.....	344	302	30	90	8	1
Freidankes Bescheidenheit..	94	83	17	88	7	2
Diu Krone.....	395	348	35	88	1	4
Ulrich von Lichtenstein..	389	340	48	87	3	3
Garel v. d. blühenden Tal(?),	338	277	28	82	7	2
Friedrich v. Sonnenburg..	26	18	21	69	...	24
Alexander.....	101	82	8	81	6	13
b) Prose.						
Altd. Pred. aus S. Paul.....	181	177	43	98	1	...

In the Bavarian-Austrian dialect conditions as to the use of strengthening particles are very complicated, and this is as true of *vil* as it is of these modifiers in general. This confusion is due largely to the wide extent of territory which is included, for it is at once apparent that no general statement of fact may be expected to apply to the whole region. Every branch, too, of literature is here represented, and not only do we find every variety of poetic art, but within the same field every degree of poetic skill, from the *Parzival* to *Garel von dem blühenden Tal*, and to the senseless interpolations in the *Nibelungen* and *Kudrun*. Each of these classes of literature may be expected to have its own traditions as to diction and word usage. The wandering “*Spielmann*” was doubtless subject to quite another fashion than that to which the writer of the court epic responded.

¹Approximately.

In the Austrian monuments *vil* continues to be the most common strengthening particle throughout the whole period. The percentages range from 69 for the lyric poems of Friedrich von Sonnenburg, to 94 for the rimed versions of Genesis and Exodus. The popular and religious epics of this dialect show a very great use of strengthening particles, greater than any class of literature in any other dialect. This may be partly due to the nature of the material. Such literature has more to do with action and incidents, less with analysis and characterization than the court epic or than lyric poetry. It is also a mark of the literary skill or lack of skill of the author. The excessive use of strengthening particles is the result of an effort on the part of the popular poet to be impressive. Not trusting to the simple narration of his story to arouse and maintain the interest of his hearers, he intersperses it with frequent emphatic expressions which indicate his own appreciation of what he relates. From this attitude of mind come also such subjective exclamations as *ah wie*, *hei wie*, *hei waz*, etc., calculated to call attention to the important parts of the story.

We may expect to find also in the frequent use of *vil* and other strengthening particles in this class of Austrian literature, a reflection of local popular usage. These words are there, especially in the older monuments, because they were current, and current in great numbers, in the spoken language. The sermon literature of this dialect shows also a greater frequency of these particles than the prose works of any other dialect. The *Altdeutsche Predigten aus S. Paul.* show 44 examples per thousand lines, Berthold von Regensburg, 47.

The actual frequency of *vil* in the poetical monuments, as shown by the above list, varies greatly. The *Nibelungenlied* shows about 100 examples per thousand lines, *Wolfdietrich A* 90, *Kudrun* 66, Ulrich von Eschenbach's *Alexander* 8. The lyrical works and the court epic show usually the lowest averages. Ulrich von Lichtenstein is exceptional in showing 48 per thousand lines. His use of strengthening particles is, however, quite in keeping with his literary style, which is always effusive.

Although the monuments from the end of the century show a considerable decline in the use of *vil*, there is no evidence that

this particle is as yet becoming obsolete. Its use in the prose literature, as well as the class of words to which it is joined in the poetical monuments, shows that it is still alive in the spoken language. Friedrich von Sonnenburg represents a locality, the Tyrol, where *gar* has already become quite popular. There is here, however, no tendency to limit *vil* to the more common phrases. Nor is there any such tendency to be seen in the Alexander.

The table for Bavarian monuments shows a decided decline in the use of *vil* by the end of the thirteenth century. *Gar* comes into prominence here earlier than in Austria, and already in the works of Berthold von Regensburg forms 73 per cent of all strengthening particles. In poetical diction *vil* retains its prominence much longer. In Lohengrin (1276-90) it shows a percentage of 49. Here, however, signs of its going out of fashion are present in the tendency to limit its use to the more common adjectives and adverbs. Nineteen of the 44 examples of *vil* are with *manec*.

SWABIAN.

	Total.	<i>vil</i> .	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil</i> .	Per cent. <i>harte</i> .	Per cent. <i>gar</i> .
a) Poetical monuments.						
Wernhers Maria.....	92	86	34	94	3	...
Bernger von Horheim....	9	9	60	100
Meinloh von Söflingen....	3	3	18	100
Heinrich von Rugge.....	25	22	44	88
Hartmann von Aue.....	17	17	32	100
Erec.....	373	350	34	93	1	2
Erstes Büchlein.....	59	51	26	85	8	...
Gregorius.....	150	102	25	67	27	1
Armer Heinrich.....	81	62	40	71	18	1
Iwein.....	249	189	23	76	16	...
Zweites Büchlein.....	15	9	12	60	20	...
Gottfried von Neifen.....	88	78	44	89	1	5
Ulrich v. Winterstetten....	138	117	50	85	4	5
Der Marner.....	54	48	...	89	...	10
Rosengarten (?).....	141	101	...	72	4	19
Wolfdietrich D.....	270	240	39	89	5	3
b) Prose.						
Bruder David von Augsburg,	15	4	...	30	...	70

In the Swabian dialect the decline in the use of *vil* toward the end of the century is only slightly noticeable, as far as any

direct evidence is at hand. The lowest percentage, as well as the lowest actual frequency, is shown by the *Zweites Büchlein* of Hartmann von Aue, where only 12 examples per thousand lines are found, these being 60 per cent of all strengthening particles. The next lowest is Gregorius, which shows a percentage of 68. This is due to the unusually high percentage of *harte*, which is here 27.

The lyrical monuments and Hartmann's earlier works probably represent the conditions in the current spoken language better than do his later works, where, as far as strengthening particles are concerned, he seems to be more under the influence of literary tradition.

Prose monuments for Swabia are rare during this period. The treatises of Bruder David von Augsburg (1230-1240) show for about 1750 long lines only 4 examples of *vil* (*wol*, *riche*, *deste*, *liep*), 11 of *gar*, and one of *sêre* (*gar sêre müelich* 12). The works of Bruder David and those of Berthold von Regensburg, with whom David was intimately associated, show a marked difference as to frequency of strengthening particles, 9 per thousand lines in the former, 47 in the latter. The proportion between *vil* and *gar* is in both practically the same. This difference of frequency of these particles may be considered largely a matter of individual style, but no doubt it is due also in part to local differences in usage.

WEST MIDDLE GERMAN.

	Total.	<i>vil</i> .	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil</i> .	Per cent. <i>harte</i> .	Per cent. <i>gar</i> .
a) Moselfrankish.						
Vorau Alexander.....	54	43	30	80	11	...
Rolandslied.....	400	373	41	95	4	...
König Rother.....	144	101	20	67	26	...
Orendel.....	202	151	38	74	9	7
Strassburg Alexander....	268	237	32	89	9	...
Sanct Brandan.....	102	80	40	83	3	8
b) Rhinefrankish.						
Friedrich von Hausen,	17	11	22	65	6	12
c) Hessian.						
Athis und Prophlias....	36	25	19	69	20	...
Liet von Troye.....	119	46	9	38	53	3
Erlösung.....	124	29	4	23	8	64
Elisabeth.....	99	34	7	34	1	44

The table for Moselfrankish monuments, which happen to be all from the latter half of the twelfth century, shows a very frequent use of *vil* in this dialect, the number of examples ranging from 20 to 41 per thousand lines. The percentages are also high, König Rother, which is the most popular in tone, showing the lowest, 67; the others range from 74 to 95.

The lyrical poems of Friedrich von Hausen (Rhinefrankish) show comparatively few examples of *vil*, 22 instances per thousand lines, which are 65 per cent of all particles. *Gar* appears here with a percentage of 12.

The monuments of the thirteenth century, which are all Hessian in dialect, show a rapidly declining use of this particle. With the exception of the first on the list, Athis und Prophlias, with 19 examples per thousand lines, the instances are rare. The Liet von Troye (1215) shows an average of 9 per thousand lines and a percentage of 38. Die Erlösung (1295) shows a still further decline of *vil*, as only 4 examples per thousand lines are found and these only 23 per cent of the whole number of such particles.

Elisabeth, of about the same date, shows a larger number of strengthening particles, and, as may perhaps be expected, a somewhat higher percentage for *vil*, which is here 34. *Vil* at this time was no doubt the weakest of all the strengtheners, and the greater the habit of using such expressions, the greater the proportion of the more insipid ones which would be included. So, conversely, a writer who uses such devices only rarely, as Wolfram von Eschenbach, would be more careful in his choice and make a proportionally greater use of those which are stronger.

While the decline of *vil* in the literary language was earlier and more decided here than in any other dialect, there is no evidence to show that even by the end of the thirteenth century it had become obsolete. In neither Die Erlösung nor Elisabeth is *vil* limited to the common locutions, but it is joined to words with which it has been by no means frequently associated, *vil mehtic*, Erl. 2637, *vil gewar* Elis. 4765, *vil ungetriuwe* 1131, *vil getriuwe* 1722, *vil ebene* 4044. This shows that *vil* is not yet a fossil element in the language. That other particles were, however, more popular in the literary language throughout the whole

century, is shown by the tables for *harte* and *gar*. In the Liet von Troye (1215) it is *harte*, which forms 53 per cent of all particles used. In the Erlösung (1295) it is *gar*, which occurs 80 times and shows a percentage of 64. In Elisabeth, of about the same date, it is *gar* also, with a percentage of 44. The predominance of *gar* over *vil* was doubtless still greater in the spoken language.

THURINGIAN.

	Total.	<i>Vil.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil.</i>	Per cent. <i>harte.</i>	Per cent. <i>gar.</i>
a) Poetical monuments.						
Heinrich v. Morungen..	43	37	...	85	...	2
Heinrich und Kunigunde,	288	214	45	71	22	1
Vater Unser.....	122	90	18	73	21	2
Der Sünden Widerstreit...	188	125	34	66	18	7
Heinrich von Meissen...	88	63	13	72	...	24
Tristan.....	121	43	8	35	4	54
b) Prose.						
Sermons of Eckard,						
Wackern. 55, 56, 60, 61,	4	100

In the Thuringian monuments the decline of *vil* is not apparent so early as in Hessian, but makes itself unmistakably felt by the end of the thirteenth century. *Harte* is quite popular here in the early part of the century, *gar* takes the lead at the end. *Vil*, both as to actual frequency, and as to its ratio to the other particles, grows steadily less from Heinrich und Kunigunde (1216) to Heinrich von Freiberg's Tristan (1301-20), with but slight exceptions. The tendency to restrict *vil* to the more common locutions is perceptible in Heinrich von Meissen, evident in Tristan. In the latter monument 43 examples are found in 5000 lines, and of these, 8 are with *liep*, 6 with *lchte*, 5 with *schiere*, 3 each with *starke*, *schöne*, *wol*, 2 each with *manec* and *reine*, and the others with *getriuwe*, *gerne*, *klein*, *süeze*, *swinde*, *zorn*.

EAST FRANKISH.

	Total.	<i>Vil.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil.</i>	Per cent. <i>harte.</i>	Per cent. <i>gar.</i>
Himmelfahrt Mariae.....	34	27	...	80	17	...
Wigalois.....	377	309	31	82	14	...
Der Winsbeke und die Winsbekin,	17	15	12	88	...	12
Der Renner.....	137	96	19	70	3	25

SOUTH FRANKISH.

	Total.	<i>Vil.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent. <i>vil.</i>	Per cent. <i>harte.</i>	Per cent. <i>gar.</i>
Moriz von Craon.....	56	35	14	62	34	...
Reinmar von Zweter.....	130	116	34	89	1	6

In East Frankish monuments no decided decline in the use of *vil* is seen until the works of Hugo von Trimberg, whose Renner shows *gar* with a percentage of 25.

In South Frankish the first monument on the list, Moriz von Craon, shows an unusually low percentage for *vil*, 62. Here *harte* furnishes 34 per cent of all particles. This monument comes from near the border line between South Frankish territory and Alemannic, and Alemannic influence has probably been at work. The percentage for *vil* is here about the same as for Lower Alemannic works of about the same date. Compare Tristan 62 per cent, Fl. und Bl. 66 per cent. In the lyric poems of Reinmar von Zweter *vil* is actually very frequent and the percentage is also high. Perhaps Reinmar represents Austrian usage as to strengthening particles rather than that of his native dialect.

Throughout the whole period of its popularity *vil* seems capable of modifying any adjective or adverb whatever. Such observations as may be made concerning the preference of one particle over another with certain classes of words, will be found under the discussion of the other particles. The following table is given to show the relative frequency of the different particles with a few of the most common adjectives and adverbs. The data given are for eight of the more important monuments of the early thirteenth century, well distributed as to dialect. Since the words chosen are the most common ones of their class, they are not those with which the newer strengthening particles are usually found, and the list therefore fails to show the true proportion between the various particles.

		Tristan.	Hartmann von Aue. ¹	Parzival.	Kudrun.	Wigalois.	Liet von Troye.	Heinrich und Kunigunde.	Rudolph von Ems. ²
vil	balde.....	1	2	3	...	1	1	...	11
harte	"	1	1	1	...	1
wol	"	10
al	"	2	1
vil	gerne.....	19	30	9	11	3	...	2	8
harte	"	1	3	...	6	...	1
genuoc	"	1
vil	guot.....	2	20	5	17	4	1	10	16
harte	"	1	3	2	...	2	7	3	1
rehte	"	1	1
genuoc	"	1	3	3
sêre	"	1
vil	grôz.....	3	15	5	7	26	1	3	25
harte	"	1	2	1	...	4	5	6	...
vil	kâme.....	6	10	4	3	7	1	...	7
harte	"	1	3
vil	kleine.....	3	2	4	4	1	4
harte	"	1	3	1	2	1
vil	liep.....	12	10	...	17	4	...	2	43
harte	"	2
vil	manec.....	19	36	3	46	40	2	6	21
harte	"	1	1	1
genuoc	"	1	...
wol	"	1
vil	nâhe.....	15	22	14	10	6	...	1	11
harte	"	2	...	2	1	...
sêre	"	2
vil	rich.....	...	6	...	10	11
harte	"	1	2	...	1	4	..	3	...
gar	"
vil	schiere.....	17	26	3	8	7	2	1	9
harte	"	1	2	4	1	1
gar	"	1

¹The data are for all the works of Hartmann except the lyrics.

²Der Gute Gerhard and Barlaam und Josaphat.

		Tristan.	Hartmann von Aue.	Parzival.	Kudrun.	Wigalois.	Liet von Troye.	Heinrich und Kunigunde.	Rudolph von Ems.
vil	sêre.....	7	35	1	18	11	...	5	17
harte	"	13	3	...	8	3	2	1	...
gar	"	1
vil	süeze.....	12	4	...	1	8	...	8	21
harte	"	2	1	...
rehte	"	5
vil	wol.....	24	60	13	23	19	6	35	25
harte	"	11	25	5	2	5	5	6	...
rehte	"	5	2	2	1
genuoc	"	1

HARTE.

Harte, as a strengthening particle, plays an important part during this period. It has been assumed that the development in meaning from *harte*, OHG *harto*, the modifier of verbs, and meaning *with force*, to *harto* the indefinite strengthening particle, was brought about by the use of the word with participles, that is, while originally only a modifier of verbs, the word came to be applied to participles used as adjectives, and then extended to other adjectives and adverbs.¹ As different stages pointing to such a development, Kip gives the following:

a) With participles used adjectively,

der 'harte stözende rām, V.M. 61-14,

b) With adjectives and adverbs derived from verbs, or closely related to verbs in form,

vil harte erchomelīcho, Ex. 544 (to *erkomen*),

c) In constructions where there is doubt as to whether it modifies a verb or a substantive idea, *wachet wan der tievel der dā ist harte iur widerwarte*, Phys. 83-12.

As a support to this theory we naturally look to see whether

¹ Kip, page 168.

harte is actually found frequently united with participial adjectives, and other adjectives derived from verbs, or similar to verbs in form. If such has been the development, we should expect to find, at least in the earlier monuments, *harte* in the greater number of instances joined to such words. That this is not the case can be readily seen from the list given by Kip of the examples from the religious poetry of the 11th and 12th centuries. Of the 72 instances cited only six: *harte erbar-meclîch*, *harte erchomenlîche*, *harte riuwec*, *harte sorclîch*, *harte unberihtet*, *harte vorhtsam*, may be reasonably connected with any verbs, and even here the connection is often but slight. Turning to the list of examples of *harte* as a verb modifier, we are also surprised at the small number of instances where it is connected with a participial construction. Of the 216 examples, only 20, or less than 10 per cent, are found as modifiers of participles, either past or present.

Turning to an older period of the language, we find that Otfrid uses *harto* 84 times¹ as a strengthener of adjectives and adverbs. Here also very little trace of a verbal idea is to be found in the words with which *harto* is connected. The list includes 25 instances with *filu*, 7 with *mihil*, 4 with *manag*, 4 with *mêr* (compar.), 3 with *scîn*, 2 with *seltsaeni*, 2 with *ungimah*. With only three of the whole number, *bîzenti*, *scîn*, and *firdan*, is there any verbal association, either direct or indirect. As a modifier of verbs, *harto* is found 124 times in Otfrid, and of this number only 10 are instances of *harto* with participles, or less than 9 per cent. Instead of being used preferably with participles and participial adjectives, *harto* seems to be avoided in such connection.

If we may judge from the actual facts as to OHG *harto*, it is very improbable that the word owes its function as a strengthening particle to its frequent use with participles, or that it passed from a modifier of verbs to a modifier of adjectives and adverbs by way of the participial adjective. If the latter usage is not as old as the former, it is at least as fundamental, and implies a certain degree of independence. Perhaps we may better look

¹ See the dictionary of Piper, where however several instances are lacking.

for the origin of such a use in the law of association of ideas. The metaphorical nature of the use of strengthening particles has been previously referred to. In such expressions as *harto filu*, *harto manag*, the attribute of one class of objects or ideas is asserted of another, for the purpose of forming, that it may be longer retained, a more striking picture.

It is natural, for instance, to associate the idea of power or strength with the ideas of size, quantity, or extent. A host of common English and German expressions are evidence of this fact. Compare *a mighty lot*, *mighty large*, *powerful great*, *mächtig gross*, *ungeheuer viel*, and MHG *starke breit und grôz*, *starke lanc*, *starke tief*.

The fact that in Otfrid 50 per cent of the examples of *harto* are united with adjectives or adverbs expressing size, quantity, distance, etc., and that during the MHG period this particle is so frequently found with such words, seems to justify the conclusion that this was the original feeling when *harte* was used as a strengthening modifier. It is but a step from *harte vil* to *harte kleine*, *harte lützel*, or from *harte verre* to *harte unverre*. These expressions, which are very common in MHG, preserve the feeling that *harte* is appropriate for ideas of quantity, though the direction is reversed.

There is another class of ideas with which the notion of power or force (*harto*, *vehementer*) is easily and naturally associated. These are subjective, and have to do with the attitudes of the mind and especially the feelings. Sometimes they denote actions or judgments of the mind, and here the connection with the use of *harte* as a modifier of verbs is closer. Compare *harte* with such verbs as *betrüeben*, *erbarmen*, *ervurhten*, *jâmern*, *klagen*, *minnen*, *müezen*, *nîden*, *riuwen*, *schamen*, *senen*, *smerzen*, *sorgen*, *trûren*, *trûwen*, *vrôuwen*, *furhten*, *wundern*, *zwîveln*. Such examples are frequent in both OHG and MHG, and form the largest class of verbs with which *harte* is united, as may be seen from Kip's list. Thus we may account for the frequency in MHG of such combinations as *harte wol*, *harte gerne*, *harte sêre*, *harte frô*, *harte schoene*, *harte sîeze*, *harte guot*, *starke frô*, *starke leit*, *starke holt*, etc. The same principle is at work in certain colloquial English expressions: *mighty glad*, *mighty fine*, *mighty bad* (East-

ern U. S.), *powerful nice, powerful handy, powerful sick, even powerful weak* (Southern).

Perhaps the tendency to associate *harte* with adjectives and adverbs in *-lich, -liche(n)*, which shows itself strongly in certain parts of the MHG field, is to be referred to this principle. The subjective element in the statement, for instance, that an action or a thing is *ritterlich, like a knight*, is large. English *a strong resemblance, strikingly similar*, may be compared.

As to the different classes of adjectives and adverbs with which *harte* is actually associated during the period in question, we may note :

a) Those expressing quantity, extent of time or space, etc., *breit, gröz, höße, kleine, káme, kurz, lanc, lützel, manec, michel, nâhen, ringe, verre, unverre, unhôch, unlanc, vol, wite, wênek*.

b) Those which express a good or desirable quality : *billich, biderbe, êrlîchen, friuntlichen, gerne, guot, güetliche, hêrlîch, kluoc, kuneclîche, meisterliche, lobeliche, milte, süeze, rehte, ritterliche, rich, staete, frô, froeliche, wol, wunneclîch, vrum, wis, zuhteclîchen, zierlich, etc.*

c) Those expressing an undesirable quality : *angestliche, bitterliche, egebar, grimmeclîchen, griuweliche, jâmerliche, klageliche, lasterlichen, leit, misselich, ungerne, nôllîch, riwic, sorclîche, schedeliche, sêre, swaere, unsuoze, ungezogenliche, ungemach, unsenfteclîch, trûrec, vreislichen, wê, wunt, zornec*.

d) Adjectives and adverbs of a kindred meaning : *krefteclîche, lâte, vaste, stark, wilde*.

e) Those of opposite meaning : *krank, lise, sanfte, swach, stille*.

f) Those of time, frequency, etc. : *vruo, spâte, dicke, selten* (not *ofte*), *gâch, swinde, schiere*.

With certain words, *harte* has not been found : *arm, edel, êbene, gevuoge, genaedec, gehiure, hoveliche, heilec, inneclîche, müede, ofte, küene, rôsevar, saelec, saeleclîche, saeldenbaere, sende, stolz, schameliche, schantliche, tugentliche, wîplichen, waerlichen*. With others, *kîusche, liep, reine, tougen, werdeclîche*, only in Middle German and there only rarely.

Many of these are frequently recurring words in the court epic, and are essentially a part of the diction of this class of literature. The absence of *harte* with these words then, would

indicate either the popular origin of this particle, and the feeling that it is more properly a part of the common speech, or at least that it had ceased to be current in the more elevated style, or was confined to certain locutions, at the time when the court epic was developing.

ALEMANNIC.

1. Poetical Monuments.	Total.	<i>Harte.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
a) Lower Alemannic:				
Reinmar von Hagenau.....	88	3	...	2
Tristan.....	412	65	3	13
Flore und Blanscheflur.....	82	18	2	22
Die Gute Frau.....	86	24	8	28
Das Steinbuch.....	27	6	6	22
Der Trojanische Krieg.....	351	14	1	4
Keiser Otte.....	22	2	3	10
Alexius.....	110	6	4	6
Martina.....	268	17	2	6
Reinfried von Braunschweig.....	97
Peter von Stauffenberg.....	46	2	...	4
b) Upper Alemannic:				
Der Gute Gerhard.....	218	2	...	1
Barlaam und Josaphat.....	304	4	...	1
Johannes Hadlaub.....	106	0
2. Prose.				
Ald. Predigt. Wack. 42-52.....	26	4	...	15
Pred. d. 13 Jahr. (Grieshaber).....	53	1	...	2

From the above table it will be seen that the lyric poems of Reinmar show few examples of *harte*, and a remarkably low percentage for their place on the list. The two monuments which show the greatest actual frequency, and at the same time the highest percentages for this particle, Die Gute Frau, and Das Steinbuch, are popular in tone. Aside from these, a gradual decline is shown in the use of *harte* throughout the thirteenth century. The percentage for Tristan is lower than that for the monument immediately following, although the actual examples are more frequent. Der Troj. Krieg shows a lower percentage than would be expected. The actual frequency of *harte* in Alexius¹ is greater than in Keiser Otte, though the

¹ Compare Hartmann's Gregorius, which is a similar story, and where *harte* is unusually frequent.

percentage is less. This is due to the great use of *vil* in this monument, which has been referred to under the discussion of that particle. Peter von Stauffenberg shows only two examples, both of which are *harte vró*, one of the most common of combinations with *harte*, which may be considered at this date is a mere formal expression.

By the end of the thirteenth century, *harte* in Lower Alemannic has practically disappeared from the literary language.

In Upper Alemannic, the examples from the works of Rudolf von Ems, which are from the early part of the century, are rare, constituting only about one per cent of all particles used. The lyric poems of Johannes Hadlaub, from the end of the century, show none.

An interesting question at this point is the relation between the use of this word in epic poetry and its use in the popular idiom or spoken language. The only examples of *harte* which have been found in the prose works of this period are from sermons 43, 45, and 46, in Wackernagel's collection, *harte widerzaeme* 43-83, *harte übel* 45-40, *harte unerberklich* 45-76, *harte sicherlîchen* 46-134, and from the volume of Grieshaber, *harte übel*, page 97. The former collection seems to date from the first half of the thirteenth century, the latter from the beginning of the fourteenth. The very infrequent use of strengthening particles in the prose literature of this dialect furnishes but little data upon which to base any conclusion as to the status of *harte* in the spoken language. What direct evidence there is, points to an early disappearance of this particle, that is, if we may look upon the single example from the volume of Grieshaber as a mere historical remnant.

We may reach a conclusion, however, by considering the adjectives and adverbs with which *harte* is associated in the poetical monuments. A word of this kind, if it has once been popular, would live on in poetic diction long after it had ceased to be current in the popular speech. It would, however, endure only in connection with those adjectives and adverbs with which it had been the most frequently associated during the period of its popularity. The unit then to be considered in determining whether *harte* is becoming obsolete, is not the strengthening

particle by itself, but the strengthener together with the modified word. The question is not whether *harte* lived on in the popular or literary language, but in what expressions it survived the longest. It may be, and actually is true that *harte wol* continued current in epic poetry until the end of the thirteenth century, while other expressions, as *harte manec*, *harte kûme*, disappeared very much earlier.

If *harte* is retained in the literary language, during the latter half of the thirteenth century, for example, only in those expressions which during the earlier period and for other dialects were the most common, we may look upon these examples as mere fossil remnants constituting a part of poetic diction, and conclude that the word has ceased to be a general strengthener of adjectives and adverbs.

In all the poetical monuments of Lower Alemannic examined, 157 examples of *harte* have been found, or outside of Tristan, which dates from the beginning of the century, and which shows not only the greatest number of examples but also the greatest freedom in the use of the particle, only 92. These 157 examples of *harte* were united with 70 different adjectives and adverbs, 33 of which are found in Tristan, 37 others in the rest of the material. The following are the more usual combinations, arranged in order of frequency: *harte wol* 22 times, *sêre* 19, *frô* 6, *kleine* 5, *unlanc* 5, *vil* 5, *grôz* 4, *schône* 4, *starke* 4, *fremde* 3, *guot* 3, *micel* 3, *suoze* 3, *wunderlîchen* 3, *gerne* 3, *kûme* 2, *kurz* 2, *lîhte* 2, *nâhen* 2, *schiere* 2, *wert* 2, etc.

In the 19 examples from the last three monuments on the list, representing the end of the century, no new combinations with *harte* appear, but all are examples of frequently recurring and well known phrases: *harte balde*, *fremde*, *frô*, *lîhte*, *micel*, *suoze*, *swaere*, *verre*, *wunderlîchen*, *vil*, *zorn*. While *harte* with *balde*, *fremde*, *micel* and *swaere* are not actually found elsewhere in Alemannic, a comparison with Middle German and Bavarian usage shows that these are old and familiar expressions.¹ The others are frequent in Alemannic. From the three works of

¹ With Hugo von Langenstein, Bavarian-Austrian influence shows itself no doubt in the use of strengthening particles as well as in the form and incidents of his legend.

Konrad von Würzburg, from the middle of the century, 22 examples of *harte* are noted in the above list. Not one of these is a new combination, all of them appearing either in early Alemannic works or in early monuments from other dialects. This is in marked contrast to the state of affairs with regard to *vil*, *gar*, *rehte*, or any particle in good current usage. With these latter, each new monument brings a host of new words with which the particle is associated.

These considerations lead to the conclusion that *harte* became obsolete as a general strengthening particle in Alemannic during the first half of the thirteenth century. In epic poetry the word lived on in the more common locutions long after it had gone out of general use, and the examples from the latter part of the century are to be regarded as fossil remnants of an older and more general use. They here make up a part of traditional poetical diction, which is preserved longer in the court epic than in other forms of literature.

In Upper Alemannic, if we may judge from the works of Rudolf von Ems, *harte* was never so common, and here it disappeared earlier.

Another question which naturally arises in this connection is, do metrical considerations have anything to do with the choice of strengthening particles? It might be suspected that where there is room in a line for a two syllable word, *harte* or *rehte* would be selected, if however a single syllable were needed to fill out the line *vil* or *gar* would be chosen. It would seem for instance, in the following lines from Wigalois, that the author used a strengthening particle, according as he had room for one or not in the line, and that he chose *vil* or *harte* without discrimination except as regards the metrical length of the word.

si lachten unde wdren fró, 105-23.

des was her Wigalois vil fró, 91-11.

des wart diu maget harte fró, 72-5.

Rudolf von Ems, however, while using *harte* with other adjectives, avoids it with *vró*, and uses other means of filling out his lines. Compare the following from Barlaam und Josaphat :

Des maht dū iemer wesen vrō, 13–29.

der herre was der rede vrō, 15–37.

des was ich herzeliche vrō, 17–32.

der vater was des kindes vrō, 20–29.

siner kunfte was er vrō, 108–28.

daz sie mit im wāren vrō, 109–38.

So in Der Gute Gerhard :

von mir des bin ich immer vrō,

des lieben trōstes was ich vrō, 6269,

des was mīn werdiu vrouwe vrō, 6311.

die ritterschaft begunde dō .

in ritterschēfte wesen vrō, 6397–8.

In these latter examples signs of mere line filling are so apparent, and *harte* suggests itself so naturally that its avoidance is striking. We may infer that this combination is unknown at this time to the poet's dialect.

BAVARIAN-AUSTRIAN.

1. Bavarian.

a) Poetical monuments.

	Total.	<i>Harte.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
Wolfdietrich B ¹	235	1
Parzival.....	293	41	2	14
Neidhart von Reuenthal (?).....	93	4	1	4
Helmbrecht.....	46	1	...	2
Die Warnung (?).....	83	3	1	4
S. Franciscenleben.....	109	11	2	10
Der Jüngere Titarel (?).....	154	0
Lohengrin.....	90	2	...	2

b) Prose.

Berthold von Regensburg.....	366	0
Altdeutsche Pred. Wack. 21–26.....	6	0

2. Austrian.

a) Poetical monuments.

Die Hochzeit.....	37	3	3	8
Genesis.....	159	2	...	1

¹ MSS. K and H read : *si schlügent auff gar balde jr reysches gezelt (gar schöne H) 39–1. Jänicke reconstructs: harte rîliche sluoc man uf diu gezelt. In view of the rare occurrence of *harte* in this monument it is probable that *gar* was the original particle used.*

	Total.	<i>Harte</i> .	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
Exodus.....	156	6	...	4
Die Bücher Mosis.....	177	7	3	4
Entricrist.....	53	1	1	2
Kindheit Jesu.....	83	11	...	13
Nibelungenlied, Version A.....	1250	92	10	8
" " B.....	82	9	7
" " C.....	71	7	7
Biterolf und Dietleib.....	701	40	3	6
Ortnit.....	126	22	9	17
Wolfdietrich A.....	250	17	7	7
Ortnit and Wolfdietrich C.....	46	3	...	6
Kudrun.....	552	62	9	11
Walther von der Vogelweide.....	145	1	...	1
Karl der Grosse.....	344	27	3	8
Freidankes Bescheidenheit.....	94	7	1	7
Diu Krone.....	395	5	...	1
Ulrich von Lichtenstein.....	389	13	2	3
Garel (?).....	338	22	2	7
Friedrich von Sonnenburg.....	26	0
Alexander.....	101	6	...	6
b) Prose.				
Aldt. Pred. aus S. Paul.....	181	2	...	1

The tables for Bavarian-Austrian show a great confusion in the use of *harte* in this dialect. The most striking feature, however, is that those monuments which show the highest percentages belong for the most part to the popular or the religious epic. They are Ortnit, Kindheit Jesu, Kudrun, Nibelungen, Wolfdietrich A. Parzival shows also a very high percentage, though the actual frequency is not so great, 2 examples per thousand lines.

The lyrical works here also show few examples of *harte*: Albrecht von Johansdorf and Friedrich von Sonnenburg none, Walther 1, Neidhart 4. Ulrich von Lichtenstein, whose works are partly lyrical, shows 13.

Next to the early popular epic and the prose monuments, lyric poetry may be expected to show the most accurately local usage as to strengthening particles. This will appear more plainly in the case of *gar*, perhaps less so with *harte*, which always seems to be more or less in disfavor with lyric writers. *Harte* appears to lack the elegance of such particles as *rehte* and

gar, and the latter are apparently preferred wherever they are current and when a stronger particle than *vil* is desired. The absence of *harte* from the works of Berthold von Regensburg, Bruder David von Augsburg, and Fr. v. Sonnenburg doubtless indicates that there was a wide stretch of territory through southern Bavaria, Swabia, and the Tyrol, where from the middle of the thirteenth century on, and probably much earlier, *harte* was unknown to the popular dialect. The statistics for Upper Alemannic indicate the same for the neighboring Swiss provinces. Throughout the whole territory *gar* was very popular at this time. Throughout the territory farther east, Carinthia, Styria, Austria proper, as shown by the works of Ulrich von Lichtenstein, the Predigten aus S. Paul., Neidhart, and the Austrian popular epics, *harte* remained current much longer. *Gar* here is scarcely known, even in the last quarter of the thirteenth century. In northern Bavaria and Bohemia, *harte* was also very popular, and continued current until late, as might be expected from the proximity to East Frankish, and Thuringia. Compare the statistics for Parzival, Wigalois, and Alexander.

In the epic poetry of the latter part of the thirteenth century, territorial distinctions as to the use of *harte*, and indeed as to diction in general, are no longer felt. Nor are the stylistic differences between the court and the popular epic so apparent. By this time the two classes of literature had approached so closely as to intermingle, and what of form and diction had originally belonged only to the one or the other, now became common property. Just as the different incidents and episodes from the works of the earlier court poets were freely made use of by the writers of the declining epic, so words, phrases, and whole periods, from one class of literature, were appropriated by the less talented writers of other classes.

This universal custom of borrowing applies no doubt to a less degree to strengthening particles, which are always more or less unconsciously used, but it still has to be taken into account even with these, especially in epic poetry. For this reason it is very difficult to locate geographically or chronologically such expressions. These borrowings are not nearly so general among lyric

writers, and in the early popular epic much less marked than in the later. These therefore offer a more reliable criterion for local usage than the later court epic.¹

The evidence for the gradual disappearance of *harte* as a strengthening particle from the spoken dialect is as strong here as in Alemannic. In Bavaria this takes place earlier than in the Austrian provinces. This is shown by the absence of the particle in the works of Berth. v. Regensburg, as compared with the examples from the *Predigten aus St. Paul*. The fact that in Bavaria *gar* appears so prominently in the popular speech, renders the disappearance of *harte* at an early stage the more probable. In the epic poetry the tendency to restrict *harte* to the commonest locutions is apparent from the middle of the century. Garel shows 22 examples which are found with *vrô*, *gâch*, *grôz*, *meisterlich*, *rich*, *ringe*, *sêre*, *seltsaene*, *sorcsam*, *tîwer*, *unhôch*, *veste*, *vruo*. Ulrich von Lichtenstein shows *harte* with *vil*, *vruo*, *vrô*, *gerne*, *hêhe*, *kleine*, *kranc*, *swach*, *wêne*. In

¹ The examples of *harte* in the Kudrun offer strong evidence of the presence of this particle in the popular dialect of Austria at the time the present version was produced, as contrasted with the dialect of the original. Various efforts have been made to separate the original elements of the poem from those parts which belong only to the Austrian redaction. (See Martin's introduction to his edition, and Wilmanns, *Die Entwicklung der Kudrundichtung*.) Those strophes which are generally considered as belonging to the original version or versions show examples of *harte* only rarely: *harte lîse* 668-4, *harte sêre* 995-3, *harte balde* 1361-3. On the other hand a very frequent use of this particle is found in those strophes which are looked upon as interpolations or contaminations of older material. 59 of the 62 examples of *harte* are found in such strophes. The author of the Austrian version evidently used those strengthening particles which were current in his own dialect.

In the Nibelungen no such difference is to be noticed between the so-called original stanzas of Lachmann and those of later origin. 63 per cent of the examples of *harte* are from the original strophes, 37 per cent from all others. A striking fact however concerning the use of *harte* here is that more than 50 per cent of all instances are from the last line of the stanza, generally the last half line, which has four accents. This might be the result of mere line filling on the part of the original author, or, perhaps in some instances, of an attempt of an interpolator to make a four accent line out of one which originally had only three (Compare Heusler, *Altdeutsche Verskunst*). Other monuments of a similar strophic form show different statistics in this regard. In Kudrun 40 per cent of all examples of *harte* are from the last line of the stanza, in Ortnit and Wolddietrich A about 19, Woldf. D about 20.

Bavarian, Lohengrin shows *harte wol* and *harte weidenlich*. This is evidence that this particle is not felt as a living element in the language.

The following list shows the more frequent combinations with *harte* in Bavarian-Austrian monuments, in order of frequency. The figures in parentheses show the number of occurrences noted outside of the three Nibelungen versions.

<i>harte sere,</i>	48 times, (30)	<i>harte lange,</i>	7 times, (7)
“ <i>wol,</i>	36 “ (27)	“ <i>swaere,</i>	6 “ (5)
“ <i>vil,</i>	25 “ (16)	“ <i>dicke,</i>	7 “ (0)
“ <i>vrô,</i>	22 “ (14)	“ <i>nâhen,</i>	6 “ (0)
“ <i>balde,</i>	21 “ (5)	“ <i>selten,</i>	6 “ (3)
“ <i>grôz,</i>	21 “ (10)	“ <i>unmaezlich,</i>	6 “ (6)
“ <i>leit,</i>	22 “ (2)	“ <i>breit,</i>	5 “ (0)
“ <i>kleine,</i>	16 “ (10)	“ <i>güetlich,</i>	6 “ (1)
“ <i>guot,</i>	15 “ (10)	“ <i>ritterlich,</i>	5 “ (0)
“ <i>schiere,</i>	14 “ (7)	“ <i>tiure,</i>	5 “ (4)
“ <i>gerne,</i>	14 “ (12)	“ <i>trârec,</i>	5 “ (1)
“ <i>vroelichen,</i>	13 “ (1)	“ <i>wê,</i>	5 “ (2)
“ <i>hêrlîch,</i>	12 “ (1)	“ <i>jâmerlich,</i>	4 “ (1)
“ <i>wênec,</i>	10 “ (6)	“ <i>kâme,</i>	4 “ (0)
“ <i>verre,</i>	10 “ (6)	“ <i>wîte,</i>	4 “ (0)
“ <i>hêhe,</i>	10 “ (3)	“ <i>vlîzeclîchen,</i>	3 “ (0)
“ <i>groezlich,</i>	9 “ (4)	“ <i>lobelîchen,</i>	3 “ (0)
“ <i>lûte,</i>	9 “ (4)	“ <i>lûtzel,</i>	3 “ (1)
“ <i>swinde,</i>	9 “ (5)	“ <i>minneclîch,</i>	3 “ (1)
“ <i>gâch,</i>	7 “ (0)	“ <i>vrûo,</i>	4 “ (3)

SWABIAN.

a) Poetical Monuments.	Total.	<i>Harte.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
Wernhers Maria.....	92	3	...	3
Erec	373	4	1	1
Erstes Büchlein	59	5	3	8
Gregorius.....	150	40	10	27
Armer Heinrich.....	81	15	10	18
Iwein.....	249	41	5	16
Zweites Büchlein.....	15	3	4	20
Gottfried von Neifen.....	88	1	...	1

	Total.	Harte.	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
Ulrich von Winterstetten.....	138	5	...	4
Rosengarten.....	141	6	...	4
Wolfdietrich D ¹	270	14	...	5

The above list for Swabian shows a very extended use of *harte* by Hartmann von Aue. The Gregorius and Armer Heinrich each show 10 examples per thousand lines, a degree of frequency only reached by the Nibelungen, Liet von Troye, Heinrich und Kunigunde, and Moriz von Craon. The percentages are also high, 27 and 20. Only Flore and Blanscheffur (28), Moriz von Craon (34), Liet von Troye (53) show a higher. Gottfried von Neifen has *harte minneclîch* 37-21, Ulrich v. Wint. shows *harte* with *schedelîch* 2-14, *wol* 5-7, *ringe* 14-14, *kleine* 24-15, 31-23. The Rosengarten shows *harte* with *wol*, *grôz*, *vrô*, *ritterlîch*, and *sêre*.

The nature of these examples from the lyrical works and Rosengarten is such that we may consider them, especially for the last half of the thirteenth century, merely as a part of the general traditional language. There is no evidence that *harte* was at this time a part of the Swabian popular speech. The treatises of Bruder David von Augsburg (ZfdA 9, 8-55.) show no traces of it. Berthold von Regensburg, who spent much of his time in traveling and preaching in Swabia, does not use it. Further prose monuments for this dialect and period are not at hand, but there is no reason to suppose that the conditions as to strengthening particles here differ in any marked degree from those in Bavaria. The absence of this particle from the sermons of Berthold is significant. Berthold's diction is very popular, and unlike Bruder David, he uses strengthening particles very freely. Frequently he has occasion to double them in order to give the desired degree of emphasis, as *vil unde vil baz* II 20-8, *gar unde gar schedelîchen* I 120-8. If *harte* had been possible we should expect Berthold to have used it. In about 375 examples of such particles however, *harte* does not once appear.

¹ Wolfdietrich D, while a Swabian version, probably represents the traditional Austrian use of strengthening particles rather than Swabian, following in this regard the earlier versions of the same legend.

An interesting fact which appears from the above table is the great difference in the frequency of *harte* in Erec and the other works of Hartmann.¹ Only four examples of this particle are found in Erec: *harte sêre* 484, *wol* 1009, *vil* 3455, *frô* 4861. Haupt, in his edition, assumes that the small number of examples of *harte* here are to be explained by the lateness of the manuscript (Ambraser 1504), or at least he makes an attempt at reconstruction by changing *gar* in a few instances to *harte*.² The frequency of *harte* however in other works preserved in the same manuscript, Moriz von Craon, Kudrun, Bit. und Diet., Kön. Rother, Helmbrecht, shows that there has been no general attempt to replace obsolete strengthening particles with those that were current.³

It is perhaps significant that the four words with which *harte* is joined in the Ambraser manuscript of Erec, *wol*, *sêre*, *frô*, *vil*, are just the four which in Upper German were most commonly found with this particle.⁴ This restriction of *harte* to these old and well known locutions would ordinarily indicate that the word had ceased to be felt as a general strengthening particle. It is then all the more curious that in Hartmann's later works

¹ Compare Vos, *Diction and Rime-Technic of Hartman von Aue*, pp. 20, 69, where this difference of usage is first noticed.

² See Vos, note p. 20; Haupt, note to line 5500.

³ In the case of the Nibelungen and Iwein a conscious attempt seems to have been made to substitute another particle for *harte*, in both cases *vast*. Bartsch Germ. X 44, notices this for the Nibelungen. The passages are, 1526-4 *harte balde* — *vast balde d* (Ambraser MS.), 1479-2 *h. grôz* — *vast grôz d*, 85-3 *h. guot* — *vast guot d*, 1279-4 I *h. hêrlîchen* — *vast h. d*, 1183-1 I *h. lûte* — *vast l. d*, 643-2 *h. vil* — *vast v. d*, 1647-2 I *h. wol* — *vast w. d*.

In Iwein, according to Henrici's variant readings, the following differences are noted: 6833 *harte gar* — *iemer mêr d*, 7238 *harte lange* — *alsô lange d*, 3514 *harte rîchez* — *riterlîchez d*, 7916 *h. stæter* — *vast s. d*, 2299 *h. unwîplich* — *vast u. d*, 6050 *h. verre* — *vast v. d*, 8131 *h. verre* — *vil v. d*, 1029 *h. vil* — *vast v. d*, 1943 *h. wol* — *vast w. d*, 6271 *h. wol* — *genug wol d*.

In the case of Erec no attempt has been made certainly to substitute *vaste* for *harte*, since only one instance of it occurs, *vaste schône* 1536.

Vaste as a strengthening particle has been found elsewhere only in the Bav.-Aust. epic: Parzival *vaste frô* 395-16, Kudrun *vaste gerne* 410-1, 1456-3 *vast an*, Bit. und Diet. *vaste guot* 1060, Wolfd. A *vaste dicke* 252-2.

These changes then which the Ambraser manuscript shows in the case of the Nibelungen and Iwein cannot have been introduced by the scribe. They date no doubt from some earlier Austrian copyist.

⁴ Compare the lists on pages 34 and 40.

this particle is not only very frequent, but joined very freely to different classes of adjectives and adverbs.¹ The following are the examples of *harte* with parallel examples from other, mostly Upper German, monuments:

Harte balde Iw. 125,² Parz. 124-23.

- " *dräte* Iw. 208, 247, Sünd. Wid. 1584.
- " *gar* Iw. 250, Erlös. 4689.
- " *gerne* Iw. 61, 246, 292, AH 213, Kud. 1173-4.
- " *gröz* Gr. 2163, AH 213, Nib. 450-2.
- " *guot* Iw. 37, Gr. 1549, AH 1218, Parz. 70-7.
- " *kleine* Gr. 3124, 3660, AH 697, Parz. 529-14.
- " *klagelichen* Iw. 194, *h. klagebaere* Iw. 253, KdGr. 1237.
- " *lützel* Iw. 139, Nib. 1489-4.
- " *lange* Iw. 265, Nib. 848-2.
- " *lise* Gr. 358, Kud. 668-4.
- " *lobebaere* Gr. 1818, *lobeliche* Kud. 1103-2.
- " *manec* Erst. B. 697, Ex. 137-16.
- " *nôt* Gr. 584, Wig. 114-11.
- " *riuwevar* Iw. 182, Gr. 428, 2327, *riuwec* Gr. 2529, Gen. 27-5.
- " *ringe* Iw. 145, Nib. 254-4.
- " *rich* Iw. 134, Gr. 2033, Kud. 1108-2.
- " *schöne* Iw. 88, *schoene* Iw. 169, Gr. 3281, 3379, AH 1375, Parz. 236-22.
- " *staete* Iw. 288, Gr. 2184, Kud. 19-4.
- " *sanfte* Iw. 132, Sünd. Wider. 2533.

¹ A comparison of the lines containing *harte* in Erec and Iwein with the corresponding passages in the works of Chrétien de Troyes shows that Hartmann in the use of this particle is not following anything in his original. Chrétien uses as strengthening particles: *forment*, equivalent to *harte*, *formant an fu joianz et liez*, Erec 372; *mout*, equivalent to *vil*, *une mout bele conjointure*, Erec 14; *tres*, OHG *drato*, *ne vuel pas que vos anpreigniez bataille si tres jelenesse*, Iwein 3739; *par*, OHG *fram*, *qui tant par est bele a mervoille*, Erec 535; *assez* (*genuoc*), *assez plus que dit ne vos ai*, Iwein 6745.

Hartmann does not follow his original so closely as to render these particles directly into their German equivalents. Aside from his free treatment of the material, considerations of rime and metrics would make a literal translation well nigh impossible.

² For Iwein the figures refer to the divisions in Lachmann's edition.

Harte schiere Iw. 147, Gr. 2330, Parz. 35-6.

" *sêre* Iw. 211, Erst. B. 861, Gr. 236, Kud. 995-3.

" *spâte* Gr. 2812, Kud. 1274-1.

" *stärclîche* Gr. 3829, *starke* Gr. 1765, Bit. u. Diet. 9202.

" *swäre* Erst. B. 1415, Nib. 1176-2.

" *schädelîche* Gr. 1278, Bit. u. Diet. 1425.

" *unsanfte* Erst. B. 298, Kud. 489-4.

" *unsuoze* Gr. 3452, Vom jüngst. Ger. Diemer 290-4.

" *ungelîche* Zw. B. 172, Bücher Mosis 68-11.

" *veste* Iw. 165, Garel 8510.

" *vremde* Iw. 263, Ex. 120-9.

" *verre* Iw. 46, 221, 223, AH 928, Kud. 702-4.

" *vrô* Iw. 210, Gr. 2532, 3075, 3326, Nib. 275-2.

" *vîl* Iw. 47, 111, 196, 230, Gr. 2321, 3778, Nib. 353-2.

" *vrum* Gr. 1886, Kön. Roth. 4148.

" *wol* Iw. 43 etc., Nib. 772-2.

" *wîs* Gr. 491, Hein. u. Kun. 313.

" *wilde* Iw. 25, Tristan 15969.

" *zierlîch* Iw. 30, Nib. 733-4 II.

" *zornlîche* Iw. 172, Nib. 826-4 II.

Harte with the following words has been found only with Hartmann: *karclichen* Gr. 2106, *müezelichen* AH 1220 *mîlte* Iw. 261, *strenge* Gr. 3020, *unwîplich* Iw. 92, *unmügelich* AH 189.

From the above list it may be seen that nearly every instance of *harte* in Hartmann can be paralleled from the Austrian popular epic. Certain expressions at this time seem to belong exclusively to the popular diction, *harte lützel*, *lîse*, *lobelîchen*, *rîch*. Many of the examples from the above list have not been paralleled from Alemannic writers, as *harte* with: *drâte*, *lîse*, *lobebaere*, *riuvec*, *sanfte*, *staete*, *spâte*, *starke*, *schadelîche*, *zierlîch*.

These facts seem to indicate that Hartmann was influenced in his later works by the Bavarian-Austrian usage as shown in the popular epic and Parzival. It is not necessary to assume that this influence came directly from these popular works, some of them being perhaps later than Hartmann's. The same local usage however that made itself felt in the popular epic evidently had its influence on Hartmann. If this be true, it would be

natural to suppose that in his earliest work, Erec, written no doubt before his undertaking the crusade, and before he had come in contact to any great extent with the class of literature prevalent in Bavaria and Austria, this influence would be absent.¹ Hartmann's use of strengthening particles then in Erec would be, to a much greater extent, a reflection of the local usage in Swabia.²

Another sign of Austrian influence upon Hartmann in his later works is his use of the particle *starke*.³ This word as a strengthener of adjectives and adverbs has been found only in the works of Hartmann and the Austrian popular or declining court epic.

WEST MIDDLE GERMAN.

	Total.	Harte.	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
1. Moselfrankish.				
Vorau Alexander ⁴	54	6	4	11
Rolandslied.....	400	17	2	4
König Rother.....	144	37	7	26
Orendel	202	18	5	9
Strassburg Alexander.....	268	25	3	9
Sanct Brandan	102	3	1	3
2. Rhinefrankish.				
Friedrich von Hausen.....	17	1	2	6
3. Hessian.				
Athis und Prophilias.....	36	7	5	20
Liet von Troye.....	119	63	13	53
Erlösung	124	9	1	8
Elisabeth	99	1	...	1

¹ In this connection compare the use of *harte* in the works of Konrad von Würzburg, who seems also to follow literary tradition as to this particle more and more in his later works. Der Trojanische Krieg shows 1.4 examples per thousand lines, Keiser Otte 3, Alexius 5, Engelhard more than 5.

Compare also Rudolf von Ems, who shows 2 examples in Der Gute Gerhard, 4 in Barlaam und Josaphat.

² For the supposed influence of Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet upon Hartmann as shown in the Erec, see Gruhn, ZfdA 43, p. 265 ff.

³ Compare the data as to *starke* under a separate heading.

⁴ The Vorau version of the Alexander, besides having a slightly higher percentage for *harte*, shows other marks of popular influence, especially in the frequency of such expressions as *du wi wie*, *du wi wie*, *d wi*. These sometimes take the place of strengthening particles in the Strassburg version. Cf. Vor. 1071, Str. 1489; Vor. 1097, Str. 1515; Vor. 1290, Str. 1792.

Although the use of *harte* was by no means regular or uniform in WMG, the above table will show that it was considerably greater than for Upper German. The word seems to have come into popularity here earlier than in Upper Germany, and its use is more general. The first five monuments on the list for Moselfrankish, all from the latter half of the twelfth century, show a greater actual frequency, and a higher percentage than do the Bavarian-Austrian works of the same period. That the use of *harte* was more general, is shown by the freer way in which it is joined to adjectives and adverbs. Many combinations are found here which do not occur in Upper German, and a larger class of words to which it may be joined is included.¹

Harte with adjectives and adverbs in *-lich*, *-liche(n)* is especially frequent. Of the 37 examples in König Rother, 21 are with such words, and 10 of the 17 in the Rolandslied. The former is supposed by the editor to have been written in Bavaria by a Frankish "Spielmann." Although the examples of *harte* are here more frequent than in other Middle Frankish works, this tendency to associate the particle with words in *lich* indicates that its use here is distinctly Frankish, rather than due to Bavarian influence.

Orendel shows 18 examples of *harte*: *harte kleine* and *harte gröz* 17 times.² This condition of affairs, where *harte* is confined to such locutions as these, we should expect to find only in works of a much later date than 1160, which is given by Berger as the probable date of the original version. The frequency of *gar* in this monument indicates also a later date, as *gar* did not make its way into the literary language of this dialect to any great extent until well into the next century. The popular nature of the poem may have something to do with the matter, though in the case of *gar*, there is no evidence that it was current so early in the popular speech.

Sanct Brandan shows a smaller number of examples than

¹ *Harte* with *ellenthaf*, *garwe*, *genöte*, *gemeit*, *kunickchen*, *liep*, *lussam*, *nutze*, *reine*, *stolz*, *tougen*, *wiplichen*, etc.

² This poem, which bears evidence of contamination and interpolation, shows frequent repetitions of lines and passages. *Harte gröz* occurs only in the line *mit harte grözen éren*, which is found 17 times in the poem.

would be expected here at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The words with which *harte* is joined however, *wislích* 339, *güetlichen* 1637, *wildgevar* 1892, indicate that the particle was in active use and not limited to the more common locutions.

The highest percentage for *harte* for all dialects and all periods is reached in the *Liet von Troye* (1215). *Harte* here forms 53 per cent of all the particles used, and occurs nearly 13 times per thousand lines. One Thuringian monument, *Heinrich und Kunigunde*, shows about 14 instances of *harte* per thousand lines, but it constitutes there only 22 per cent of all particles.

There is probably a distinction to be made in the use of this particle between Hessian and other WMG dialects. In Hessian at least, *vil* had taken a very subordinate position early in the century. Its place during the first part of the century was taken, as may be seen from the *Liet von Troye*, by *harte*; for the latter part, as in the *Erlösung* and *Elisabeth*, by *gar*. The general popular use of *harte* here is the more probable because it was current also in the neighboring province of Thuringia.

The decline in the use of *harte* toward the end of the century is very marked in the Hessian dialect. The examples in the *Erlösung* (1295) *harte wol*, *vil*, *lange*, *wirdeclíchen*, *garwe*, do not indicate that its use was limited entirely to formal literary expressions, but they show a tendency in that direction. The *Elisabeth* shows a still lesser use of *harte*, *harte genuoch* being the only instance in 5000 lines.

The list of words with which *harte* is most frequently joined in WMG shows a slight difference between WMG and Upper German usage. They are: *grôz* 23 times, *wol* 17, *vil* 16, *schône* and *lane* 5, *vromiclíche*, *sére*, and *wislíche*, each 4, *liep* and *lussam* each 3.

THURINGIAN.

	Total.	<i>Harte.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
Heinrich und Kunigunde.....	288	62	14	22
Vater Unser.....	122	26	5	21
Der Sünden Widerstreit.....	188	33	9	18
Tristan.....	121	5	1	4

The table for Thuringian shows a free use of *harte* at the beginning of the thirteenth century which gradually decreases

until the end. The lyrical works show no examples at all. Heinrich und Kunigunde shows the highest actual frequency and the highest percentage for *harte*. In this monument the combinations are very free, and it is altogether probable that *harte* at this time was a part of the Thuringian popular speech. Besides the more common phrases we find: *harte böse, keiserlich, kiusch, reine, rôt, scharf, tiure, unsaelec, gewis, sicher, sagebaere*.

The Vater Unser, from the middle of the century, shows less than half as many examples, but the percentage is about the same. Here too the combinations are free, *harte wise, rehte, sleht, bröde, kluog*, being found besides the more common expressions.

In Der Sünden Widerstreit the 33 examples of *harte* are with 22 different words. Although these happen to be the words with which *harte* is quite commonly found, they are sufficient in number to show that this particle is still freely used.

In Tristan but 5 examples are found in 5000 lines, and these constitute but 4 per cent of all particles. These do not seem to be limited to the common locutions, *harte megetlich, harte minneclichen, harte stolzlich, harte vil*. It would seem that here as in Hessian *harte* was felt until late in the century as a general strengthening particle.

The sermons of Eckard, Wackernagel 60-61, 65-66, show only 4 examples of strengthening particles, all of which are *gar*.

SOUTH AND EAST FRANKISH.

	Total.	<i>Harte</i> .	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
1. East Frankish.				
Mariae Himmelfahrt.....	34	6	...	17
Wigalois.....	377	55	6	14
Der Renner.....	137	4	4	3
2. South Frankish.				
Moriz von Craon.....	56	19	11	34
Reinmar von Zweter.....	130	1	...	1

South and East Frankish monuments show likewise a free use of *harte* early in the century. Moriz von Craon from near the Alemannic border, probably shows Alemannic influence. The lyric monument of this group shows only a single instance of

harte. The examples from the Renner are limited to the stereotyped expressions *harte wol* and *harte wunneclîch*.

GAR.

Gar, as an indefinite strengthening particle, is found as early as the twelfth century in Upper German. The original meaning of OHG *garo*, used adjectively, was *prepared, complete*. As an adverb *garo, garawo*, meant *entirely, ganz und gar*. Both of these uses extend into the MHG period. König Rother 3411, *zwelf dûsent rîtdre wale gare*, (twelve thousand knights well prepared for war) is an instance of the first. *Gar* however is generally used in MHG adverbially, and is generally defined in the dictionaries as meaning *completely*.¹ While the examples from the twelfth and early part of the thirteenth centuries are meager, there is no doubt that, as applied to adjectives and adverbs, this word had become weakened in force to a mere indefinite strengthening particle. By the end of the century it had become well established in this use in the literary language of all dialects.

The process of weakening of *gar* is quite parallel to that through which modern German *ganz* has passed. *Gar* as applied to an adjective or an adverb originally signified the highest degree or completeness of the quality under consideration. *Gar guot*, and later *ganz gut*, were then equivalent to MHG *vollen guot*, and meant *perfect*. Then from the easy habit of exaggeration, always a characteristic of popular speech, the word came to be applied where the quality instead of being absolute was only relatively high, and the expression began to be taken with a grain of allowance. In the case of *gar* this discounting of the face value went on so far that its original meaning was lost sight of entirely. In the works of Berthold von Regensburg *gar* is no longer felt as having any of its old meaning of completeness. When the author wishes his readers to take the word literally, in its strongest sense, he finds it

¹ Benecke-Müller-Zarncke, I 480², 5-31. Lexer I 738, *gar, gänzlich, völlig, ganz und gar*. Haupt, Erec, note to line 5500.

necessary to repeat the particle: *gar unde gar wol*, I 44-7, *gar unde gar überguot* II 36-18. The author of the *Erlösung* (1295), uses a similar device, that of adding the word *ganz*, *der kinde zal hân ich gelesen ganz gar ungesundert*, 3645-6. In the case of modern German *ganz* the weakening has gone so far that *ganz gut*, *ganz selten*, mean rather less than *sehr gut*, *sehr selten*, and approach the meaning *passably good*, *not very often*. The phrase *ganz und gar* is thus merely an effort to retrieve the lost meaning of *ganz* and make a strong expression out of two weak ones.

In the earlier MHG works it is often difficult to determine whether *gar* is used in its original and more general sense, or whether it is weakened and takes the place of some other indefinite particle. With adjectives and adverbs representing an absolute quality, that is, one not capable of different degrees of intensity, it has necessarily the former meaning. If, however, the word denotes a quality only nominally absolute, and this can be determined only by the context, then the particle could have correspondingly weakened force. This is in fact a very frequent occurrence. *Gar lûter*, *gar durhliuhtec*, like *vil unschuldec*, *vil eine*, would often represent merely an indefinite degree of the quality under consideration.

When *gar* is joined to adjectives and adverbs with the prefix *un-*, the particle might seem to retain its original meaning of *entirely*, *completely*. The dictionary of Benecke-Müller-Zarncke quotes *gar ungerne*, Arm. Hein. 179, *gar unmaere*, Walth. 65-15, as instances of such a usage. If we remember however that these words with the prefix *un-* in MHG do not necessarily denote a negative notion, but usually one that is decidedly positive, we see at once that *gar* may here express merely high degree. Just as *vil lützel*, *vil kleine*, usually took on the derived meaning *not at all*, so *unhovelîch* often expressed not a mere absence of the quality of *Höflichkeit*, but the presence of its direct opposite. *Gar unhovelîch* could be rendered then *very impolite*, *very rude*. Likewise *gar unsanfte*, *very roughly*; *gar unverre*, *very near*.

The accent of the word would have something to do with the turn of its meaning. Strongly accented it would necessarily mean *ganz und gar*. In verse this might happen if it were

placed at the point of chief accent, the end of the line. Or the emphasis might be indicated by placing the word out of its usual position. For this reason *gar* in postposition, or before the indefinite article, or falling at the end of the line, would be more likely to have its stronger original meaning. Compare: *daz er ewelichen gar wil irliuhten ir schar*. Vat. Uns. 1983-4.

Throughout the earlier period, *gar* was doubtless felt as a much stronger particle than *vil*. In the literary language it had the element of freshness, and the implied comparison with the idea of completeness was no doubt felt. Though never, perhaps, so strong as *harte*, it came into vogue at a time when that particle was distinctly felt to be quaint and obsolescent.

The following lists will show that *gar* during this period is capable of being joined to any class of adjectives or adverbs whatever. In the earliest examples the more common of these words: *balde*, *dicke*, *gerne*, *manec*, *schiere*, *sêre*, *schône*, *vil*, *wol*, etc., are perhaps conspicuously lacking. It was with just such familiar words as these, however, that the older particles, *vil*, *wol*, *harte*, were retained the longest. *Gar* is just coming into prominence in the literary language during this period, and it naturally obtained a footing first with those words with which the older particles had not been so closely associated. With the more common adjectives and adverbs it displaced these older particles but slowly.

ALEMANNIC.

1. Poetical monuments.

a) Lower Alemannic.

	Total.	Gar.	Per cent.
Reinmar von Hagenau.....	88	2	2
Tristan	412	0	0
Flore und Blanschefur.....	82	5	6
Die Gute Frau.....	86	5	6
Das Steinbuch.....	27	0	0
Der Trojanische Krieg.....	351	29	8
Keiser Otte mit dem Barte.....	22	2	9
Alexius.....	110	7	6
Martina.....	268	19	7
Reinfried von Braunschweig.....	97	21	21
Peter von Stauffenberg.....	46	7	15

b) Upper Alemannic.

Der Gute Gerhard.....	218	7	3
-----------------------	-----	---	---

	Total.	<i>Gar.</i>	Per cent.
Barlaam und Josaphat.....	304	9	3
Johannes Hadlaub.....	106	37	35
2. Prose.			
Altd. Predigt. Wack. 42-52.....	26	4	15
Pred. d. 13 Jahrh. Grieshaber.....	53	36	68
Pred. auf. Joh. d. Täufer.....	3	2	66

The Alemannic epics show more clearly perhaps than the monuments of any other dialect, the gradual coming into literary usage of this particle. The percentage for *gar*, as shown by the above table, gradually increases, with few exceptions, throughout the whole period. *Tristan* with no examples dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century. *Rein. v. Braun.* and *Peter v. Stauf.*, which show the highest percentages for Lower Alemannic, are from the end. The two lyrical monuments, *Reinmar* and *Joh. Hadlaub*, show a higher percentage than their position in the table would warrant.

The Alemannic Predigten of Wackernagel (sermons 42-52) show very rare instances of *gar*, and for this reason are probably to be placed very early in the thirteenth century. Grieshaber's Altd. Predigt. show a percentage of 68, which indicates, as mentioned under the discussion of *vil*, that they should be placed in the fourteenth century.

In Upper Alemannic *gar* probably came into popularity earlier than in Lower Alemannic. *Harte* disappeared here very early, as we have seen. The percentage of 35 for this particle in the works of Johannes Hadlaub (1302) shows that by this time it had become quite familiar.

The words with which *gar* is joined in the poetical monuments are numerous, as is to be expected in the case of a particle just coming into prominence. The contrast in this regard between *gar* and *harte* is very marked. The following are the most frequent combinations: *gar inneclîch*, *lâter*, 4 times each; *elent-riche*, *minneclîche*, *ritterlîche*, *vlizeclîche*, 3 times each; *gehiure*, *hôch*, *gewaltec*, *liutsaelec*, *trûebe*, *senfte*, *unmaere*, *unmdzen*, *unsanfte*, *unlange*, *wunderlîch*, twice.

BAVARIAN-AUSTRIAN.

1. Bavarian.

a) Poetical monuments.

	Total.	Gar.	Per cent.
Albrecht von Johannsdorf.....	13	1	8
Parzival.....	293	7	2
Wolfdietrich B.....	235	7	3
Neidhart von Reuenthal	93	4	4
Die Warnung.....	83	2	2
S. Franciscan Leben.....	109	11	10
Der Heilige Georg.....	86	6	7
Der Jüngere Titrel (?).....	154	17	11
Lohengrin.....	90	35	39

b) Prose.

Berthold von Regensburg.....	366	266	73
------------------------------	-----	-----	----

2. Austrian.

a) Poetical monuments.

Genesis.....	159	1	...
Enticrist	53	2	4
Kindheit Jesu.....	83	1	1
Ortnit.....	126	1	1
Wolfdietrich A.....	250	1	...
Ortnit and Wolfdietrich C.....	46	1	2
Kudrun.....	552	2	...
Walther	145	11	7
Karl der Grosse.....	344	4	1
Freidankes Bescheidenheit.....	94	2	2
Die Krone.....	395	15	4
Ulrich von Lichtenstein.....	389	12	3
Garel von dem blühenden Tal (?).....	338	8	2
Friedrich von Sonnenburg.....	26	6	24
Alexander.....	101	13	13

b) Prose.

Altdeutsche Predigten aus S. Paul (1300).....	181	0	
---	-----	---	--

From the above tables for Bavarian-Austrian, it will be seen that the lyrical monuments, Alb. v. Johannsdorf and Walther, show relatively high percentages. In the Austrian popular epic *gar* is remarkably rare. The Nibelungenlied offers one instance from the version C, Kudrun 2, Biterolf und Dietleib none, Ortnit and the different version of the Wolfdietrich very few. The Bavarian monuments show the greatest frequency of this particle and the highest percentages, S. Franciscan Leben 10 per cent, Lohengrin 39. Ulrich von Eschenbach who follows the traditions of the court epic more closely, and who perhaps

represents the local usage of Bohemia, uses this particle rather sparingly, though he writes from the end of the thirteenth century.

The absence of *gar* from the early Austrian popular epic indicates that this particle was not current in the popular dialect of that region at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Considering the great frequency of strengthening particles in the Nibelungen, and the great variety there offered, there is no way to account for the absence of *gar* except on the ground that it was unknown to the popular speech. Biterolf und Dietleib, from Styria, suggests the same state of affairs for that part of the territory. The examples of *gar* in the later popular epic, especially the later versions of Wolddietrich, may be ascribed to local influence in the different dialects in which they were produced, or to the fact that by this time *gar* had become a rather common literary term. Further indications of the absence of *gar* from the popular speech in certain parts of the Austrian territory is offered by its absence from the Predigten aus S. Paul., from Carinthia.

Ulrich von Lichtenstein (Styria, 1255-57) shows a percentage of 3 for *gar*. His use of this particle is no doubt due to the influence of *gar* in the other literature of his time rather than from any natural tendency to use it. Had *gar* been current in his native dialect, considering his fondness for effusive and emphatic declaration, we should expect every page of his poetry to show numerous examples.

That *gar* was current however in Bavaria, is shown by its frequency in the Bavarian epics mentioned above, and by the sermons of Berthold von Regensburg. These show in 8000 long lines 266 examples, or 73 per cent of all particles.

In the poetical monuments of Bavarian-Austrian, the number of adjectives and adverbs with which *gar* is associated is very great; *gar vil* occurs 5 times, *gar schöne*, 4 times; *gar* with *gesund*, *unmaere*, 3 times; with *bereit*, *dicke*, *heimlichen*, *hêre*, *müede*, *riche*, *unverzaget*, *unsinneclich*, *unsanfte*, *wunneclich*, *wol*, twice. Berthold von Regensburg, in the sermons examined, uses *gar wol* 37 times, *gar vil* 26, *gar grôz* 12, *gar guot* 11, *gar übel* 8, as compared with *vil wol* 17, *vil grôz* 1, *vil guot* 1, *vil übel* 1.

SWABIAN.

	Total.	Gar.	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
a) Poetical monuments.				
Erec.....	373	9	1	2.5
Gregorius.....	150	2	...	1
Der Arme Heinrich.....	81	1	...	1
Gottfried von Neifen.....	88	4	2	5
Ulrich von Winterstetten	138	7	3	5
Der Marner.....	54	5	1	10
Rosengarten.....	141	26	...	19
Wolfdietrich D.....	270	9	...	3
b) Prose.				
Bruder David von Augsburg.....	15	11	...	70

The above table shows a gradually increasing use of *gar* in Swabian throughout the whole period. Hartmann makes a very sparing use of this particle except in Erec. The presence of *gar* in Erec to a greater extent than in his later works, where he is more in line with traditional usage, is to be taken as evidence that he took this particle from his native dialect. Its increasing frequency in the later lyrical monuments and in Rosengarten, indicates the growing popularity of *gar* in the popular speech. Wolfdietrich D follows doubtless the traditional word usage of the older versions, though the presence of *gar* is probably the result of local influence.

The popularity of *gar* during the latter half of the thirteenth century in Bavaria, doubtless extended also into Swabian territory, especially the southern part, and reached over into Upper Alemannic. Bruder David von Augsburg shows the same percentage for *gar* as Berthold von Regensburg, though he does not use strengthening particles so frequently.

WEST MIDDLE GERMAN.

	Total.	Gar.	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
a) Moselfrankish.				
Orendel.....	202	14	3	7
Sanct Brandan.....	102	8	4	8
b) Rhinefrankish.				
Friedrich von Hausen.....	17	2	4	12
c) Hessian.				
Athis und Prophlias.....	36	0
Liet von Troye.....	119	4	1	3
Erlösung.....	124	80	14	64
Elisabeth.....	99	44	9	44

In WMG *gar* is practically unknown as a strengthening particle before the thirteenth century. Orendel shows 14 examples, but in view of its absence in other important monuments, it is altogether likely that these belong to a later reworking of the poem, and not to the original version, which the editor dates about 1160. Sanct Brandan (1200) is the first monument to show reliable examples of this particle, which occurs here 8 times.

In the Hessian dialect, Herbolt von Fritslar (1215) uses *gar* very rarely in the Liet v. Troye, 4 times in 5000 lines. Some of these instances may perhaps be questioned. In the Erlösung (1295) *gar* is the chief strengthener, 80 examples being found and these constituting 64 per cent of all particles used. In the Elisabeth *gar* is also the most frequent particle, though it shows here a percentage of only 44. The predominance of *gar* at this period in Hessian and Thuringian, as shown by its use in the poetical monuments, is more decided than anywhere else in the MHG field. This is the natural consequence of the early decline of *vil* in these dialects.

THURINGIAN.

	Total.	<i>Gar.</i>	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
a) Poetical monuments.				
Heinrich von Morungen.....	43	1	...	2
Heinrich und Kunigunde.....	288	2	...	1
Vater Unser.....	122	2	...	2
Der Sünden Widerstreit.....	188	13	4	7
Heinrich von Meissen.....	88	21	4	24
Tristan.....	121	65	13	54
b) Prose.				
Sermons of Eckard, Wack. 55, 56, 60, 61.....	4	4	...	100

In Thuringian *gar* is rare before the latter half of the thirteenth century. The lyrics of Heinrich von Morungen show *gar unhô* 133-26; Heinrich und Kunigunde, *gar reht* 175, *gar lîhte* 2604; Vater Unser *gar gebrûderlîche* 175, *als gar gehôrsam* 1878. In the lyrics of Heinrich von Meissen *gar* is much more popular, and in the Tristan Fortsetzung of Heinrich von Frieberg it constitutes 54 per cent of all strengthening particles.

That *gar* was current in the popular speech of this dialect by the end of the century at least, is to be assumed by its frequency

in the literary monuments. The same is indicated by its presence in the sermons of Eckard.¹

EAST FRANKISH.

	Total.	Gar.	Per cent.
Wigalois.....	377	2	...
Winsbeke und Winsbekin.....	17	2	12
Der Renner.....	137	34	25

SOUTH FRANKISH.

Reinmar von Zweter.....	130	8	6
-------------------------	-----	---	---

In the South and East Frankish monuments *gar* shows itself also but rarely before the second half of the thirteenth century. Two questionable examples are found in Wigalois, Winsbeke shows one unmistakable example, *gar alt* 60-5, Winsbekin *gar wisiu* 9-9. The lyrical poems of Reinmar von Zweter show 8 examples, or 6 per cent of all strengthening particles, which is a high percentage for his time (1227-60). Der Renner shows a percentage of 25 for *gar*, *vil* being the most common strengthener with a percentage of 70.

WOL.

Wol as an indefinite strengthener of adjectives and adverbs is somewhat frequent during this period, especially during the early part. This use of the word is so closely connected with *wol* the adverb of manner, and the strengthener of a whole assertion, that the two must be considered together. The word is derived from the root of *wollen*, and therefore meant, in the first place, *according to wish, in a desirable manner*, then, *thoroughly*. As a modifier of verbs, and denoting the manner in which the action is performed, *wol* is frequent with such

¹The statement of Paul in his dictionary under *gar*: "Volkstümlich ist dieser Gebrauch nur im Süden," if true, can apply only to modern times. Compare also Kip, p. 160, commenting on this statement of Paul: Diese dialektische Eigentümlichkeit scheint bis in alte Zeit zurückzureichen.

words as *bewarn*, *behagen*, *gezemen*, *phlegen*, *tuon*, etc. Here the original meaning of the word is the most clearly preserved.

More frequent however than with such verbs, and more important for the later development of the word, are the instances of *wol* with verbs of knowing, believing, perceiving through the senses, seeming, etc. This use of the word is so common and well understood that it is hardly necessary to cite examples. The following may however be given :

ich weiz wol daz er sich machet nâch uns zehant uf die slâ.
Krone 3239.

ich meine wol daz ir sît ein vil erklicher zage. Krone 3758.

als ich nû wol waene. Fl. u. Bl. 1447.

ich sihe wol daz der tût die liebe muoz verenden. Fl. u. Bl. 1456.

do verstuont sich wol diu reine daz ich gerne bî ir was.
Iwein 332.

dô ich im alsô nâhen quam daz er mîn wol war genam.
Iwein 471.

irn vastet niht, daz hoere ich wol. Iwein 817.

ez schînet wol . . . daz disiû rede nâch ezzen ist. Iwein 815.

In such examples as these, *wol* shows little of its original connection with the verb *wollen*, but has become merely a general strengthener of the verbal idea expressed by the word it modifies. In this use it is so firmly fixed, however, that no other strengthening adverb can take its place, even at the present time. If any other adverb is used, it adds another meaning entirely. Compare for instance: *diu minne weiz die liste gar*, Fl. u. Bl. 678, where *gar* logically does not modify the verb at all, but *die liste*.

From its long and intimate association with such verbs as *wizzen*, *denken*, *gelouben*, *waenen*, *schînen*, etc., *wol* becomes largely subjective in its meaning. It represents more than any other adverb can do in MHG the personal opinion of the speaker. This appears very plainly in the next important function of the word, its use as a general strengthener of an assertion. The literature of the period is full of examples, a few of which will suffice :



*die wile der admirât lebt eine, sô muge wir wol vor im genesen.*¹
Alex. 5234. *Wol* here is equivalent to *ich geloube wol*, surely.

hêten si noch grôzer kraft, got machet uns doch wol sigehaft.
K. der Gr. 9054. (*Wol*, I firmly believe.)

*tuostû dan die widerkêre âne grôze dîn unêre, sô bistû wol ein
vrûm man.* Iw. 558. (*Wol*, I will acknowledge.)

*dô huop sich vil grôz weinen, und schrê, owê mir armen, daz ez
wol môhte erbarmen ein flînshertez herze.* Fl. u. Bl. 1484. (*Wol*,
I am quite ready to believe.)

ichn habe iu selhes niht getân, ir môhtet mich wol lebn lân.
Iwein 173. (*Wol*, *ich dæhte wol*, I should think.)

*er was einem Môre gelich, michel und als eislich daz ez nie-
men wol geloubet.* Iwein 429. (That very likely no one will
believe it.)²

In most of the instances where *wol* is thus used as a sentence
modifier in MHG it serves to add strength to the assertion,
the above examples, where it savors of Mod. Germ. *wohl*, being
exceptional. From this use the Mod. Germ. indefinite sense

¹ *Wol* here has little or nothing to do with the verb *mûgen*. It modifies the
whole statement not the auxiliary verb. This may perhaps be better seen
from the following: *ein man slûege wol ein her ob ez dne wer waere.* Krone 830.
The sense is that one man would no doubt succeed against a whole army, not
that he could slay the army with little effort. Kip's classification of *wol* with
the auxiliaries especially *mûgen* and *kunnen* is of no significance whatever
(p. 221). It is the exception if *wol* modifies the auxiliary. Nor is his theory
as to the weakening of *wol* logical. He says: "*Wole* stêht in formelhafter
Verbindung mit gewissen Verben, deren Bedeutung im Laufe der Zeit derartig
verschoben wird, dass eine unbestimmte Möglichkeit an Stelle des älteren
bestimmten Begriffes tritt. Diese Verben schlepten gewissermassen das
Adverbium mit, so dass die Unbestimmtheit, die ursprünglich nur an das
Verbum haftete, nach und nach auch auf das Adverbium übertragen wurde.
Vor allem gehören hierher die beiden Verben *mûgen* und *kunnen*." In so far
as these and other auxiliaries, in connection with their infinitives, frequently
refer to a future action, some uncertainty may be present. But this is no
more true of *mûgen* and *kunnen* than of *werden* and *sollen*, or the present tense
of any verb used as a future. It is not necessary that *wol* should be carried
along in its development toward the stage of indefiniteness, by any verb or
class of verbs. With this particle, as well as with others which originally
signified a state of completeness or definiteness, this weakening was rather the
result of sheer wear, of too frequent use.

² See Bech, note to Iwein 1762, "*wol* = leicht, möglicherweise." 173 and
429 are however unexplained.

of the word, as in "Sie sind wohl ein Franke?" is descended. That this process of development or weakening had already begun in MHG may be seen from the above examples.¹ Signs even of the use of *wol* in concessive clauses (Mod. Germ. *obwohl*) are at hand during this period. *Doch swaz ez dar umbe si, er mac uns wol gescheiden, doch mac er niht erleiden mir iuwer werden minne.* Fl. u. Bl. 1280-4. (*Wol*, to be sure, *zwar*.)

Being thus a general strengthener of an assertion, it is quite easy to localize the word and make it applicable to an adjective, an adverb, or even a numeral. It is then difficult, often, to determine whether the particle modifies the verb, the whole sentence, or the adjective or adverb. Compare the following: *daz was och wol gevüege daz man im niht zerlüege*, etc., Mart. 39-63. Where the adjective is in attributive position it is reasonably certain that *wol* is intended merely as a strengthener of the adjective, but with adjectives in the predicate, and with adverbs, the difficulty is nearly always present.

In *wol* as a modifier of a numeral the same development took place as in *wol* the sentence modifier. Originally it was felt as a real strengthener. *Kuster mich? Wol tûsentstunt*, Walth. 39-26, at least a thousand times. That the writer or speaker thought he was keeping well within the bounds of truth, is shown by the frequent addition of the words *oder mære*, *oder baz*; *wol vierzic tûsent oder dannoch baz*, Nib. 181-3. *Wol hundert oder mære*, 279-3.² Again it is shown by an effort to state the number exactly, instead of expressing it roundly: *wol vierdehalbe klafter lanc*, Bit. u. Diet. 7500.³ This force of the word was however soon lost, and most of the examples of *wol* with numerals during this period are to be taken as equivalent to "etwa," "ungefähr."

As a strengthener of adjectives and adverbs it is to be noticed that *wol* is often found with words expressing distance, motion,

¹ This weakening in the force of *wol* is parallel to that which has taken place in *zendre*, *ungevdr*, *vaste*, *gewis*. The excessive use of such asseverations, and the general experience that they are necessary only where room for reasonable doubt exists, has caused them one after another to be discounted.

² Compare Wieland, Geron der Adelige, I, line 295: *Wohl siebzig Jahre mögen's sein und mehr*.

³ Compare *wel nyne and twenty in a companye*, Chaucer Cant. Tales, Pro. 24.

or some space relation, such as *verre, lanc, wîten, nâch, âf, hin*, etc. The starting point seems to be the idea of motion from some place, and *wol* expresses the same turn of thought as English *well* in such expressions as *well away, well beyond, well along*. Comparison with *wol* the sentence strengthener may not be lacking in these examples, though the relation to *guot* is perhaps closer, *wol* being here equivalent to *a good distance*. Compare *einen guoten wec hin*, Iwein 5553. Quite of the same nature are such expressions as *ich wil beliben baz*, Walth. 88-34, *nâher baz*, Rol. 4274, and *vûrbaz*, English *better than a mile*. In all such figurative expressions the measuring standard of one class of ideas, with its different gradations, is applied to another class. *Wol nâch*, Eng. *well nigh*, represents the same turn of thought. Probably originally applied to space relations, *wol nâch* meant *well along towards*, afterwards *well nigh*. Compare *nâch* as a preposition. Wolfram uses *wol nâch*, Parz. 132-27, *wol nâch gein der mîle zîl*.

Wol is more frequently found associated with adjectives formed from past participles, and retaining something of their verbal meaning, or with adjectives similar in form to participles, and easily associated with the corresponding verbs. Sometimes the particle is inseparable from the participle, and the two form a single compound expression. For example, *wol getân*, *wol geslaht* (old French *de bon aire*), *wol gestalt*. In such instances, *wol* retains its original force, either as meaning *in a desirable manner*, or *well, thoroughly*, as when modifying verbs of knowing or believing. In many cases no other strengthener may be used, which is evidence that *wol* is not here weakened to a general strengthening particle. Further examples of such are: *wol gesunt*, *wol kunt*, *wol bekant*, *wol genuot*, *wol bereit*, *wol wâr*.

Like *rehte*, *wol* is sometimes found with words of a kindred meaning. This may be compared to the Mod. Germ. colloquial heaping together of adjectives having a similar meaning, for the purpose of expressing a high degree of the quality. Compare for instance, *fein artig*, *fein ehrbar*, *hübsch schön*, etc., English *good and hot, nice and clean*. Examples of such a usage in MHG, in which the original meaning of *wol* is to

a greater or less degree felt, are : *wol billich, wol veile, wol wert, wol behagen*, etc.

Unlike *rehte*, *wol* is not found with words of an opposite meaning. This indicates that the association in meaning of the particle and the original adverb was always more or less present.

Finally *wol* is applied to other adjectives and adverbs and has the force of an indefinite strengthening particle. With these it can take the place of some other strengthener. That its field of usefulness should here be limited, is easy to understand when we consider that the process of weakening, by which this particle approached in meaning Mod. Germ. indefinite *wohl*, was well under way during the thirteenth century. Its career as a modifier of adjectives and adverbs was thus cut short.

Being so largely subjective in nature, and used so generally with gradually weakened force as a sentence strengthener, *wol* was never a strong or very emphatic particle.

To be compared with *wol* are such phrases as *ze wunsche, ze freude, ze prise*, all of which are comparatively frequent.

Following is a list of the words with which *wol* as a strengthening particle is associated in Upper German.¹ *Wol* with these

¹ Haupt, in his edition of the Erec, reconstructs *vol* in several instances where the manuscript reads *wol*. Thus, *vol karger man* 2381, *vol tugentliche* 9909, *mit vol blanker varwe* 7293, *vol alsô* 7244, *vol minneclichen* 6794. In this he follows Lachmann (See Haupt to 2381, L. to Iwein 3179). *Mit vol blanker varwe* is evidently from analogy to *vol liehter varwe* 7729 (note to 2381). *Vol* is however here not a modifier of *liehter*, but *liehter varwe* is a genitive depending on *vol*, and the line should be rendered, "full of brilliant color." So Henrici, following Lachmann, has *unz vol nâch mittem tage*, Iwein 7239; *DEJbegr wol*. All such reconstruction is unjustified. *Vol* seems never to have been weakened to a general strengthening particle. Certainly it is not so used by Hartmann. Compare Erec 4816-20: *ich bite iuch, tugenthafter man, sit ir mir sit gewesen guot, daz ir mir vol(le) wol tuot, daz ich iuch müeze erkennen: geruochet iuch mir nennen*. *Vol* in this passage is not a strengthener of *wol*, as English *full well*, but modifies the verb *wol tuon*, and has about the same force as *vol* in *vol sprechen*. Compare *und als er vol sich geneic*, Iwein 3944, *sult ir volvarn*, Iw. 6150. The passage means, "since you have already done me one favor (to return his horse as requested) I beg that you will go further and do me the highest, the complete honor of telling me your name." So line 7375, *Ein phärt schoene und volle guot*. *Volle guot* means *perfect in every respect*, not merely *very good*, as may be seen from the context: *weder ze nider noch ze hô*, 7341, and *alsô was ez volkomen daz er dar abe niht hete genomen also grôz als umbein hâr*, 7386-8. So *vollen guot*,

is not always free from traces of its original meaning, though examples where this is manifestly retained are excluded. *Wol bereit, genuot, gewar, kunt*, are very frequent. *Wol balde* occurs 10 times, *geliche*, 9; *schin, billich*, 3; *gevuoge, gemeit, her, manec, uf, verre, veile, war, wert*, 2. With other words only a single instance each has been found.

The greater part of the examples of *wol* are from the beginning of the thirteenth century or earlier. In Alemannic, Gottfried's *Tristan* shows 28, or 70 per cent of the whole number for this dialect. In Swabian they are, with one or two exceptions, from *Erec* and *Iwein*.¹ In Bavarian-Austrian the three *Nibelungen* versions show 22 examples, *Diu Krone* 7, *Parzival* 3. Elsewhere are only scattering examples, many of which are doubtful. By the end of the century this particle had practically become obsolete, its use being confined to such expressions as *wol veile*, *wol uf*, and to those connections where its original force was largely retained, as *wol bereit, wol kunt*, etc. It is exceedingly rare in the prose monuments for the whole period. *Berthold von Regensburg* shows *wol billich, wol manic*.

In Middle German the examples of *wol*, where it may be considered as an indefinite strengthening particle, are rare and scattering before the latter part of the thirteenth century. *Die Erlösung* (1295) shows 7, *Elisabeth* 14. In the latter monument the examples are so numerous and so evidently genuine as to suggest the fact that *wol* was at this time current in the popular dialect.

REHTE.

Rehte, OHG *rehto*, as a strengthener of adjectives and adverbs is found very early in the Germanic dialects: *rehto ubarlât*, Ot.

Arm. Hein. 1177, *uns kan daz niht gewerren iuwer maget enst vollen guot*, which should be rendered, "that your maiden be not fully perfect," which was demanded to effect a cure. (See *Bech's* note to this passage).

Elsewhere examples of *vol* have been noticed: Hein. v. Meissen, *Leiche* 3-8, *vollen smachajt*; *Martina*, 38-55, *vol geswinde*; *St. Brandan* 1826, *vollen gerne*; *König Tirol*, 1-3, *volle lobesam*; Hein. v. Freiberg, *Tristan vollen wît und grôz*, 1158, *vollen hôch* 6044. Other examples have been noted where the original meaning of the word is manifestly retained.

¹ Zw. Büchl. *wol bescheiden* 69, *wol vrûm* 479.

IV, 24-26 ; *rehto virinlîh*, Mus. 10, and *rehto palwîc*, 26. The word is from the same root as Latin *regere*, to guide or straighten, Mod. Germ. *richten*, and is a participial formation. The original meaning was, *in a straight way*, then, *correctly*, *in a proper manner*; Ot. III, 23-39. *mir . . folge, ther rehto gangan wolle*.

The different stages in the development of the word as it came to be applied to adjectives and adverbs are not easy to follow. It is probable however that the process was quite different from that in the case of *wol*. There is no reason to believe that the idea of what is right or just, entered into the conception of the word, and that from this it passed to the idea of *generously*, *in a rich measure*, *to a high degree*. Had such been the development, we should expect to find it at first associated with words of a kindred meaning. This does not however seem to be the case. Its connection with *virinlîh*, terrible, and *palwîc*, destructive, in the Muspilli, shows that no such idea is there present. It is more probable to assume that an early differentiation of meaning took place, and that there resulted on the one hand, Mod. Germ. *recht*, *gerecht*, on the other hand, the strengthening particle, which passed through some such stages as *exactly*, *fully*, *to a high degree*. Evidence of such a development is to be found in the use of the word with *als*, *alsô*, *alsam*: Compare *reht' also ich in ê seite*, Tr. 3468 ; and further, such phrases as, *rehte unz in diu tor*, Tr. 387 ; again, such examples as *was ir varwe wîz rôt var, noch rehte wîz, noch rehte rôt*, Liet v. Tr. 602. In each of these, *rehte* has the force of *exactly*, *gerade*, as English *right up to the gate*.

The same idea is expressed in the use of *rehte* with numerals, *rehte vierdehalp*, Vom Antichrist, 283-13; *rehte vier und zwanzic*, Str. Alex. 5095. Before numerals *rehte* does not appear to have been weakened to *ungefähr*, *about*, as in the case of *wol*. This function was assumed by the latter particle exclusively.

Rehte, then, joined to adjectives and adverbs, marked originally the completeness of the quality, and had little or no connection with the idea of what is right or proper. *Rehte guot* meant *good in the fullest sense of the word*. *Rehte leit* implied that the thing or condition of affairs to which this expression referred was such that it might correctly be described in these

terms. From this meaning *rehte* was easily weakened to a general strengthening particle.¹

As thus used it will readily be seen that *rehte* was very emphatic, approaching in force to *harte*. That it was a more polite and elegant word is indicated by the preference shown for it by the lyrical writers.

In the majority of instances, *rehte* as a strengthening particle is preceded by *also*, *sô*, *wie*, *swie*, or some such adverb, as was the case with *gar* during the earlier part of the period. The use of such expressions in connection with *rehte*, or rather the use of *rehte* or *gar* in such instances where a striking comparison is to be made, or a clause of result introduced, indicates merely that these were felt as very strong particles.

ALEMANNIC.

1. Poetical Monuments.	Total.	<i>Rehte</i> .	Per 1000 lines.	Per cent.
a) Lower Alemannic.				
Reinmar von Hagenau.....	88	11	5	13
Tristan.....	412	34	2	8
Flore und Blanscheflur.....	82	17	2	21
Die Gute Frau.....	86	4	1	5
Das Steinbuch.....	27	4	4	14
Der Trojanische Krieg.....	351	41	4	12
Keiser Otte.....	22	1	1	5
Alexius.....	110	1	1	1
Martina.....	268	15	2	6
Reinfried von Braunschweig.....	97	4		4
Peter von Stauffenberg.....	46	3	3	6
b) Upper Alemannic.				
Der Gute Gerhard.....	218	6	1	3
Barlaam und Josaphat.....	304	4		1
Johannes Hadlaub.....	106	15	7	14
2. Prose.				
Aldt. Predig. Wackernagel I-LII.....	91	4		4
Deut. Predig. d. 13 Jarhr. Gries.....	53	7		13

The tables for Alemannic show a very irregular use of *rehte* throughout the thirteenth century. Flore und Blanscheflur shows the highest percentage, next come the popular Steinbuch, and the two lyrical monuments. These latter, Reinmar von

¹ Compare in this regard English *right* and *downright*, the latter retaining to a greater extent its original force. *Downright nonsense*, *geradezu Unsinn*, but also *downright glad*, *downright sorry*.

Hagenau and Johannes Hadlaub, show the highest actual frequency, 5 and 7 per thousand lines respectively. There is a marked difference between the three works of Konrad von Würzburg, *Der Trojanische Krieg* showing 41 examples, or 12 per cent, *Keiser Otte* and *Alexius* a single instance each.

The number of words with which *rehte* is joined in Alemannic is very large. The following are the more frequent combinations: *rehte wol* 15, *schöne* 9, *suoze* 8, *minneclîch* 6, *wunneclîch* 6, *frô* 5, *guot* 5, *keiserlîch* 4, *vîn* 3, *wê* 3, *hóch* 3, *nâhen* 3, *ungerne* 3, *wert* 2, *bitterlîchen* 2, *dicke* 2, *leit* 2, *manec* 2, *swaere* 2, with about 60 other words a single instance each.

From this list it appears that whatever the process of development through which *rehte* has passed, the actual usage of the particle during this period has been influenced by the original color of the word as shown in the adverb of manner. In the majority of instances *rehte* is united with words expressing a good or desirable quality. Words of the opposite meaning are not lacking, though they are not so numerous.

BAVARIAN-AUSTRIAN.

	Total.	<i>Rehte.</i>	Per Ct.
1. Bavarian.			
a) Poetical Monuments.			
Parzival.....	293	9	3
Neidhart von Reuenthal.....	93	4	4
S. Franciscan Leben.....	109	4	4
Der Heilige Georg.....	86	2	2
Lohengrin.....	90	6	7
b) Prose.			
Berthold von Regensburg.....	366	2	..
2. Austrian.			
a) Poetical Monuments.			
Genesis.....	159	3	2
Die Bücher Mosis.....	177	1	
Kindheit Jesu.....	83	1	1
Nibelungen.....	1250	57	8
Biterolf und Dietleib.....	701	4	..
Wolfdietrich A.....	250	3	1
Kudrun.....	552	13	2
Walther.....	145	10	8
Karl der Grosse.....	344	7	2
Freidankes Bescheidenheit.....	94	1	1
Ulrich von Lichtenstein.....	389	21	5
Garel von dem blühenden Tal (?).....	338	9	3
Friedrich von Sonnenburg.....	26	2	8
b) Prose.			
Altd. Predigten aus S. Paul.....	181	2	1

The frequency of *rehte* in Bavarian-Austrian monuments is also irregular. Here the lyrical works show the highest percentages: Walther and Fried. v. Sonn. show each 8 per cent, Ulrich v. Licht. 5, Neidhart 4. The epic monument showing the highest percentage is Lohengrin, which has many popular features of style. The Nibelungen come next with 5 per cent.

Rehte has been found in Bavarian-Austrian with about 170 different words. Of these the greater number express a good or desirable quality. The most frequent are: *rehte wol* 13, *minneclîch* 10, *hêrlîch* 7, *schône* 7, *guot* 6, *lieplîchen* 5, *manlîch* 5, *liep* 5, *vroelîche* 4, *vrô* 4, *sûeze* 4, *reine* 3, *vriuntlîch* 2, *gemuote* 2, *wunneclîchen* 2.

Those of a more or less opposite meaning: *rehte leit* 9, *wê* 3, *grimmeclîchen* 3, *jaemerlîchen* 2, *swaere* 2, *vientlîchen* 2; further a single instance of each of the following: *boese*, *grimme*, *kumberlîchen*, *klagelîche*, *tobelîche*, *trûrec*, *ûbele*, *unsanfte*, *unfriuntlîchen*, *unvroelîchen*, *vreisclîch*, *vientlîche*, *unreine*.

With words of an indifferent color: *rehte gar* 6, *kunt* 3, *kûme* 2, *nâhen* 2, *wâr* 2, *grôz* 2, etc.

SWABIAN.

	Total.	<i>Rehte.</i>	Per Ct.
Wernhers Maria.....	92	2	2
Heinrich von Rugge.....	25	3	12
Erec.....	373	4	1
Erstes Bûchlein.....	59	1	2
Gregorius.....	150	3	2
Armer Heinrich.....	81	1	1
Iwein.....	249	5	2
Zweites Bûchlein.....	15	1	7
Gottfried von Neifen.....	88	5	6
Ulrich von Winterstetten.....	138	9	6
Rosengarten.....	141	3	2

In Swabian *rehte* is more popular with writers of lyric than of epic poetry. Heinrich von Rugge shows the highest percentage, Hartmann's Zweites Bûchlein, Gottfried von Neifen, and Ulrich von Winterstetten come next in order. Otherwise there seems to be nothing peculiar concerning the use of the word in this dialect. *Rehte minneclîchen* occurs 3 times, *rehte guot*, *rehte gûetlîchen*, *rehte wunneclîchen*, *rehte wol*, twice each.

MIDDLE WEST GERMAN.

	Total.	<i>Rehte.</i>	Per Ct.
a) Moselfrankish.			
Vorau Alexander.....	54	1	2
Orendel.....	202	13	6
Strassburg Alexander.....	268	4	2
Sanct Brandan.....	102	1	1
b) Rhinefrankish.			
Friedrich von Hausen.....	17	2	12
c) Hessian.			
Athis und Prophlias.....	36	1	3
Liet von Troye.....	119	2	2
Erlösung.....	124	5	4
Elisabeth.....	99	3	3

THURINGIAN.

Heinrich von Morungen.....	43	3	7
Heinrich und Kunigunde.....	288	2	1
Vater Unser.....	122	1	1
Der Sünden Widerstreit.....	188	13	7
Tristan.....	121	3	3

In WMG and Thuringian *rehte* is rare as a strengthening particle throughout the whole period. Only two monuments show more than 5 examples. Orendel offers 13. This monument is exceptional also in the use of *harte* and *gar*, as has been previously mentioned. Der Sünden Widerstreit, which is popular in tone, shows 13 examples, or 7 per cent. The lyrical monuments show the highest percentages: Friedrich von Hausen 12, Heinrich von Morungen 7.

Rehte wol is here the most frequent combination, occurring 8 times, *rehte gerne* is found 5 times, *rehte lieplichen* 4, *rehte schoene* 3.

EAST FRANKISH.

	Total.	<i>Rehte.</i>	Per Ct.
Himmelfahrt Mariae.....	34	1	3
Wigalois.....	377	8	2
Der Renner.....	137	3	2

SOUTH FRANKISH.

Moriz von Craon.. .. .	56	0	..
Reinmar von Zweter.....	130	5	4

The South and East Frankish monuments show also very few examples of *rehte*. The lyrics of Reinmar von Zweter show the highest percentage. With the exception of the latter monument the instances are less than one per thousand lines.

Rehte is thus seen to belong more particularly to Upper German, and to be most frequent in Alemannic and Bavarian-Austrian. There are no signs of its becoming entirely obsolete at any time, and it doubtless continued in use down to the present.

GENUOC.

Genuoc, OHG *ginuog*, Gothic *ganohs*, is connected with the Gothic preterit-present verb *ganah*, *it satisfies*. This word is used in MHG as a strengthener of adjectives and adverbs as well as verbs. No similar use of the word occurs in OHG or Gothic. What is perhaps the original meaning may be seen in Gothic *ganohs*, which signifies primarily *much*, then *sufficient*. Compare: *jah mid iddjedun imma siponjos is ganohai*, Luke 7-11, and many of his disciples went with him. And further, *Nauh ganoh skal qipan izwis*, John 16-12, I have much yet to say to you, *ganoh* here being a translation of the Greek *πολύ*.

Throughout the OHG period the two notions of *much* and *sufficient* are associated with the word, both as adjective and as adverb. Compare Merigarto 4, *Ūz der erda sprungan manigslahete prunnen, manig michil sē, in hōhe unt in ebene, uuazzer gnuogiu*, where *uuazzer gnuogiu* is to be rendered *much water*.

Otfried uses the word *ginuag* in both senses: III, 25-38, *Fon thesses dages fristi sō was in thaz sīd festi in muate ginuagi, festi ginuagi* being rendered *sufficiently firm*. In the following, *ginuag* has the force of *richly, in full measure*: *Allez guat zi wāre sō flōz fon imo thāre allen liutin ioh ginuag*, III, 14-82.

This double meaning holds for the word during the MHG period. Compare: *Er hāt wēne, und ich genuoc*, Parz. 7-6. As a modifier of a verb: *Ouch weiz ich's selbe genuoc*, Tristan 13963. It is hence very easy to join this adverb to an adjective or another adverb as a mere strengthening particle. It is not necessary to assume that the word was first used in this connection ironically, as the dictionary of Benecke-Müller-Zarnke states.¹

¹ See also Kip, p. 165.

The early history of the word is evidence to the contrary, as is also the fact, which will appear below, that *genuoc* is used much more frequently with words expressing a good or desirable quality than with those of opposite meaning. The earliest instances of this use of the word, *genuoc hère* Gen. 57-9, *genuoch redespæche* Gen. 130-2, *rethehaft genuoge* Rol. 1371, 8788, are with adjectives of such a nature. With these it is very unlikely that irony can be intended.

Genuoc as a strengthening particle is nearly always in postposition, and almost invariably in rime. Besides the examples mentioned above, the following have been noted where the particle stands before the word it modifies and outside of rime position. Wolfd. C. III, 45-4, *gnuoc lange*; Moriz von Craon 715, *genuoc rîche*; Gebet einer Frau, Diemer 381-19, *genuch dikke*; Athis und Prophlias C*27 so *rîten sie gnuoc träge*; Pred. aus S. Paul. 76-15, *di tåten sich uf und wurden genuoch lebentich*. Hartmann's Erec offers three instances out of eight, before the word modified:

von dem hûs gnuoc verre, 9870.

wan sî was genuoc fruo, 2442.

beidiu gnuoc kuntlich, 2340.

The first five thousand lines of Iwein offer five examples of *genuoc*, all of which are in postposition: 1789, 2033, 2711, 3462, 4868. Five instances are found in the remainder of the poem, and these all stand before the modified word:

er ist gnuoc tumpræze, 5242.

nû ist ez gnuoc billich, 5244.

daz lebn was gnuoc kumberlich, 5574.

begunden sî gâhen . . engegen im gnuoc verre, 6474.

ir herze ist ein gnuoc engez vaz, 7044.

Armer Heinrich shows: *nû ist genuoc unmügelich daz ir deheiniu . . lîde den tót*, 453; *nû vernam er daz sî waere genuoc unwandelbaere*, 1172. The Erstes Büchlein has *gnuoc tiur* 390.

Genuoc rimes almost invariably with either *truoc* or *sluoc*. The two examples from the Rolandslied quoted above rime, or rather assonance, with *kuone*. Parzival 157-3, Guter Gerhard

5943, each rime with *kluoc*. Outside of rime but in postposition *genuoc* is found : Troj. Krieg 211, *van mir ist sanfte genuoc dá mite* ; Ath. und Proph. E150, *al wêr er sêre genuoc virladin*.

The fact that this particle appears so rarely outside of rime position, and that the rime words in this ending are so few, suggests that it is preserved in the epic merely for the sake of rime. *Truoc* and *sluoc* form an important part of the word stock of epic poetry, and but for such a word as *genuoc*, which as a strengthening particle may be tacked on almost anywhere in a sentence, the monotony of constantly riming the two words together would be great. Hartmann's freer use of the word may indicate that it was current to a greater degree in Swabia than elsewhere.

Associated in meaning, as it is, with the idea of sufficiency, we should expect *genuoc* to be united preferably with words expressing a good or desirable quality. The lists which follow will show that such is the case. Of this nature are *bescheidenlich*, *billich*, *biderbe*, *edel*, *gerne*, *guot*, *hêre*, *hêrlich*, *holt*, *kostlich*, *küene*, *mitte*, *liep*, *riche*, *sanfte*, *schöne*, *sælec*, *snel*, *süberliche*, *unschuldec*, *unwandelbaere*, *friuntlich*, *vrô*, *vroelich*, *vrum*, *vlizec*, *wise*, *wislich*, *wol*.

It is found also with words of the opposite meaning : *grimme*, *grimmec*, *griuwelich*, *heinlich*, *leit*, *nôt*, *swaere*, *trûrec*, *ûbele*, *unsælec*, *vient*.

Aside from these, *genuoc* seems capable of modifying any class of adjectives or abverbs whatever, and to have no other special color.

The following lists show the occurrences of this particle which have been noted.

ALEMANNIC.

	Total.	<i>Genuoc</i> .	Per Cent.
a) Lower Alemannic.			
Flore und Blanscheflur.....	82	3	4
Die Gute Frau.....	86	2	2
Der Trojanische Krieg.....	351	6	2
Keiser Otte.....	22	2	9
b) Upper Alemannic.			
Der Gute Gerhard.....	218	4	2

BAVARIAN-AUSTRIAN.

	Total.	<i>Genuoc.</i>	Per Cent.
1. Bavarian.			
a) Poetical monuments.			
Parzival.....	293	14	3
S. Franciscan Leben.....	109	2	2
Lohengrin.....	90	3	3
b) Prose.			
Berthold von Regensburg.....	366	0	
2. Austrian.			
a) Poetical monuments.			
Genesis	159	2	1
Kindheit Jesu	83	8	10
Nibelungen.....	1250	44	3
Biterolf und Dietleib.....	701	12	2
Wolfdietrich A.....	250	2	1
Ortnit and Wolf. C.....	46	1	...
Kudrun.....	552	17	3
Karl der Grosse.....	344	4	1
Freidankes Bescheidenheit.....	94	1	1
Die Krone.....	395	2	
Garel von dem blühenden Tal.....	338	10	3
b) Prose			
Altd. Predig. aus S. Paul.....	181	2	1

SWABIAN.

Erec.....	373	8	2
Erstes Büchlein.....	59	1	2
Gregorius.....	150	2	1
Armer Heinrich.....	81	2	2
Iwein.....	249	10	4
Der Marner.....	54	1	2

WEST MIDDLE GERMAN.

Rolandslied.....	400	2	...
Sanct Brandan.....	102	4	4
Athis und Prophilias.....	36	3	9
Elisabeth	99	1	1

THURINGIAN.

Heinrich und Kunigunde.....	288	5	2
Vater Unser.....	122	1	1
Tristan.....	121	4	3

SOUTH AND EAST FRANKISH.

	Total.	<i>Genuoc.</i>	Per Cent.
Wigalois.....	377	4	1
Moriz von Craon.....	56	2	4

The above lists indicate that *genuoc* as a strengthening particle is more particularly Upper German usage. The Bavarian-Austrian monuments show the greatest frequency. The highest percentage is found in the *Kindheit Jesu*, 10 per cent, *Kudrun* and *Parzival* show each 4, the *Nibelungen* and *Garel* 3, *Biterolf* and *Dietleib* 2. The other monuments show an inconsiderable number, one per cent or less.

The absence of *genuoc* in lyrical works is noteworthy. This is no doubt partly due to the fact that the rime words for *genuoc*, *truoc* and *sluoc*, are either not a part of the word stock of lyrical poetry, or, as in the case perhaps of the latter, found only rarely. No doubt also *genuoc* was felt to be obsolescent as a strengthening particle, and such words, unless they happen to be a part of the traditional lyrical diction, are not apt to find a place in lyric poetry.

In the case of some of the examples quoted, particularly from the latter part of the thirteenth century, there may be doubt as to whether they are really intended as strengthening particles. Those from the *Predigten aus S. Paul* seem to indicate that the word was current in this portion of the field (Carinthia) at that late date. Even here, though, they may be merely remnants such as might be preserved in religious diction long after they had become obsolete elsewhere. *Berthold von Regensburg* shows no examples, nor have any been found in the sermon literature elsewhere.

The examples from the Alemannic monuments are rare. None are to be found in *Tristan*, and they are only scattering elsewhere. None are found in the works from the end of the century. Instances of *genuoc* with a word expressing an undesirable or evil quality are relatively few in Alemannic, or only 2 out of 18. This is in contrast to Austrian usage, particularly in the popular epic, where this particle with such words as *grimme*, *leit*, *trûrec*, *zornec*, etc., is comparatively frequent.

In Swabian the examples of *genuoc* are all from the works of Hartmann with the exception of *wislîch genuoc*, Der Marner 15-16. This is the only example of *genuoc* with lyrical writers that has been noted. Iwein shows the highest percentage, though the word is actually nearly as frequent in Erec.

In South and East Frankish, only Wigalois and Moriz von Craon show examples of *genuoc*. In these it is found only with *guot*, *riche*, and *sûberliche*.

In Middle German the instances of *genuoc* are also few and scattering. None deserve special mention except perhaps those in Heinrich von Freiberg's Tristan, which are remarkable for their late date (1303-1320).¹ They occur here however in rime, which may account for their presence.

SERE.

Sêre, OHG *sêro*, an adverbial form of the adjective *sêr*, is frequent during this period as a modifier of verbs. As such it meant originally, *sorely*, *with distress*. It was then generalized as a strengthener of a verbal idea and could be applied to any kind of a verb. As applied to adjectives and adverbs, and weakened to an indefinite strengthening particle, it is found in certain parts of the MHG field.

Before *sêre* appears as a general strengthener of adjectives and adverbs, it is found with certain participles which have a meaning similar to that of the particle. *Sêre wunt* is perhaps the most common of these; *sêre erschraht* occurs in Kudrun 59-1, *sêr gesêret*, Diu Krone 6344. It is found then with adjectives and adverbs of a kindred meaning: *sêre leit*, St. Fr. Leben 1950, Krone 16623; *sêre ande*, Krone 4393; *sêre kranc*, Krone 6698; *vîl sêre siech*, Rein. v. Zweter 140-1; *sêre nôt*, Hein. u. Kunig.

¹ Heinrich von Freiberg, although he endeavors to continue in the same spirit as the original Tristan and makes frequent use of epithets and phrases from Gottfried's version, shows no signs of influence from this source in the matter of strengthening particles. Gottfried's strengtheners are, in the order of their frequency: *vîl*, *harte*, *wol*, *rehte*, *sêre*; Heinrich's, *gar*, *vîl*, *harte*, *genuoc*, *rehte*.

99; *sêre gehaz*, Garel 2648; *sêre lasterbaere*, Garel 976. In these examples, instances of the association of related ideas are offered, and *sêre* retains something of its original meaning. Its use however extends to other connections, where all trace of its original meaning seems to have disappeared. In Alemannic monuments the following have been noted: ¹ *sêre ande*, Trist. 13543; *erbärmeclîch*, 1764; *fröudehaft*, Trist. 586, Troj. Krieg 6906; *fröudebaere*, Alex. 938; *frô*, Trist. 11385; *grôz*, Fl. u. Bl. 4342; *guot*, Trist. 172, Fl. u. Bl. 3765; *irresam*, Trist. 11830; *kriecheft*, Troj. Kr. 1562; *leit*, Trist. 6820, Troj. Kr. 7083; *missevar*, Trist. 12750; *nâhen*, Rein. v. Hag. 160-28, Trist. 7251; *rich* 2747, 4583; *starke*, 5877; *scharph*, 9027; *trârîc*, 2601; *schadehaft*, 6990; *unfrô*, 2337, 2552, 11531; *vür*, 6295; *wê*, 12257, 12752; *willec*, 5062.

This use of *sêre* is confined almost entirely to Lower Alemannic, and appears here only in the first half of the thirteenth century. Gottfried von Strassburg's Tristan furnishes the greater part of the examples, 23 out of a total of 31.

In the other dialects the examples of *sêre* are scattered and are found chiefly with *wunt*, and adjectives and adverbs of a kindred meaning, as noted above. Aside from these the following may be cited: Diu Krone, *sêre lanc*, 8709; Sünden Widerstreit, *harte sêre unfrô*, 1683; *sêre unrehte*, 1826; *sêre vaste*,

¹ These examples from Alemannic writers, and the fact that this particle seems to disappear from the literary language during the thirteenth century, are interesting in view of the statement of Paul in his dictionary, that *sehr* is unknown to the popular speech in Upper German (dem Schwäb-Bair. fremd, dafür *arg*, *recht*, *fast*, *gar*. Kluge.).

This use of *sêre* is not noted in the MHG dictionaries. Benecke-Müller-Zarncke quotes *sêre wunt*, but states that "bei den attributiven Adjectiven findet sich *sêre* nicht." Tristan 583, 2552, 11531, 5877, are examples of *sêre* with attributive adjectives.

Bechstein makes no note of this use of the word in the vocabulary of his edition of the Tristan, and only a passing reference to it in a note to line 9027, the sixteenth time the word occurs: "*die wâren gesliffen sêre scharph unde wahs*; *gesliffen* ist aufzufassen als adjectivisches Participium, nicht als reines Particip., das folgende *scharph* ist Adj. nicht Adv. zu *slîfen* und *sêre* ist Adv. zu *scharph*, nicht zu *gesliffen*."

Bechstein apparently takes *sêre* in this connection here as a matter of course.

1828 ; *sêre wunt*, 2444 ; Heinrichs Buch,¹ *gar sêre bitter*, 1166 ; *sêre snel*, 1466 ; *sêre wol*, 1514, 2188 ; *sêre freudenrîche*, 2380 ; Br. David, *gar sêre mûelîch*, p. 12.

STARKE.

Starke as a strengthening particle is to be compared with *harte*, Modern German *mächtig*, English *mighty*. Like *harte*, it was probably first applied to adjectives and adverbs expressing quantity, distance, etc., and illustrates the tendency to associate the idea of strength with that of size. Besides adjectives and adverbs of quantity, it is united preferably with those which express an unpleasant or undesirable quality, although it is found not infrequently with those of opposite meaning.

Under the first category, may be noted : *starke grôz*, Nib. 2039-1 ; *starke breit und grôz*, Krone 1227 ; *starke lanc*, Krone 3114, *starke tief*, 3315.

Under the second : *starke leit*, Nib. 641-3, Iwein 3007, 3240, Krone 838, 9209 ; *starke bleich*, Krone 9920 ; *s. trûebe*, Nib. 843-4 ; *s. unvrô*, Iw. 1432 ; *s. vîent*, Nib. 1865-1 ; *s. wunt*, Iw. 5463, 5564 ; *s. wilde*, Krone 5522 ; *s. wê*, Nib. 1013-2, 1026-4, Zw. Büchl. 149.

Under the third : *starke frô*, Wern. Maria 205-32 ; *s. holt* Greg. 1652 ; *s. wol*, Krone 2841, 2906, 6259, 5154, 5656 ; *s. lîhte*, Krone 5948. Further examples are : *starke ungelîch*, Krone 981 ; *s. unmaere*, 3170 ; *s. ger*, 5623 ; *s. gezan*, Iw. 455.

It may be seen from the above lists that the use of *starke* as a strengthening particle is essentially Austrian, and that it is very limited. The examples are all from the early part of the thirteenth century. As to Hartmann's use of this particle,² mention has already been made under the discussion of *harte*.

¹ This monument shows a most varied and curious assortment of strengthening particles. The older ones are intermingled with those more modern in such a way as to suggest great contamination. For this reason the examples here found have not been included in the previous lists. They include : *vîl* 36 times, *wol* 34, *harte* 22, *gar* 15, *sêre* 5, *vaste* 3, *rehte* 2, *billîch* 2, *michel* 1, *al* 1, *sunder* 1.

² This does not seem to be a mere question of editing. Henrici notes no variant readings for Iwein.

AL.

Throughout this period, *al* is generally used in its literal sense, and means *altogether, ganz und gar*. Occasionally it is found weakened in force to an indefinite strengthening particle. As such it is to be compared with *gar, rehte, vaste*, which originally indicated a state of completeness of the quality expressed by the word modified. Only occasionally is *al* found with adjectives or adverbs denoting any other than an absolute quality. Such combinations as *al begarwe, al besunder, al eine, al geliche, al gemeine, al zesamene, al ze mál*, etc., are the most frequent. That such were not generally understood as examples of indefinite strengthening particles is shown by the manuscript and text confusion as to *al*. Frequently it is inflected, *alle*, and made to agree with the subject of the proposition, as, *sie gingen alle gemeine*.

When this particle occurs with words not necessarily denoting an absolute quality, it is difficult to determine whether the writer means it as an indefinite strengthener, or intends that it should be taken in its literal sense. It depends then largely upon the individual peculiarity of the author, and whether he is given to harmless exaggeration in this way. The instances where this particle is plainly to be taken as an indefinite strengthener are rare. They are to be found in the Austrian popular epic and in *Parzival*. The latter monument offers the greatest number of genuine examples. Compare *al balde*, 127-18, 633-23; *al blôz*, 560-14; *al blûweclîche*, 633-28; *al breit*, 739-13; *al ehte*, 233-26; *al kurz*, 227-10; *al niuwe*, 396-24, 435-17, 530-14; *al sanfte*, 581-2; *al sâr*, 514-19; *al starc*, 522-15; *al stille*, 358-21, 386-28; *al trûrec*, 822-11, 133-4; *al vaste*, 324-1, 368-1, 410-20, 553-30; *al vrô*, 209-25, 286-16, 540-16; *al wâr*, 210-18, 276-2; *al wîs*, 301-8, 457-12.

MICHEL.

Aside from its more frequent use with comparatives, *micHEL* is found during this period in a few instances as a general strengthening particle. In original meaning *micHEL* is similar to *grôze* and *vil*, and like the latter, it is a comparatively colorless adverb. It is doubtless largely owing to this fact that it never came into more general use. Having nothing in the way of special significance to recommend it as an effective strengthener, and the field being already largely occupied by *vil*, there was no general demand for such a particle. In the transitional, or pre-classical MHG period, scattered instances of this particle are found, as well as in the monuments of the early part of the thirteenth century.¹ The following have been noted for the period under consideration :

Kudrun, *micHEL hōch unt starc* 65-2, *micHEL reht* 984-1 ; Sanct Brandan, *micHEL nōt*, 263 ; *micHEL grōz*, 1480 ; *vil micHEL grōz*, 1558 ; Heinrichs Buch, *micHEL grōz*, 2248 ; König Rother, *micHEL leith*, 3429, 2467 ; Woldiet. D, *micHEL swaere*, VI, 68-4 ; Altd. Predigt. Wack. *micHEL reht*, 27-4, 27-63.

GRIMME.

Two Austrian monuments show examples of *grimme* as a general strengthening particle, the Nibelungen, and Diu Krone of Heinrich von Türilin. In the former are found *grimme küene*, 872-3 II, 2038-4 ; *grimme leit*, 50-3 II, 192-1, 620-2 II, 641-3 II, 1274-1, 1458-3, 1718-3 II, 1933-2, 2066-3 I, 2098-3 ; *grimme starc*, 185-4 I, 872-3 I ; *grimme vrient*, 1865-1.

Diu Krone, *grimme armstarc*, 1292.

¹ Compare the citations by Kip, p. 178, also the following : *micHEL vreissam*, Judith MSD 3-2 ; *wē micHEL lāt*, Lob Salomon, MSD xxxv, 3-4 ; *mihhil gotlich*, Freis. Ausl. des Paternosters, MSD LV, 2 ; *mihhil sere*, Seq. de S. Maria, MSD xli, 28 ; *micHEL reht*, Geb. einer Fr. Diem. 376-11.

Kip's statement that *micHEL* during this period is found only with *reht* is therefore incorrect.

STRENGTHENING PARTICLES WITH COMPARATIVES.

With comparatives the list of strengthening adverbs is not so large as with the positive degree. *Vil*, *micheel*, and *verre*, are the most frequent, instances of *gar*, *genuoc*, *witen*, *maneges*, are rare, and no others have been noted. The reason for this lies in the nature of the comparison. What is emphasized in a strengthened comparative is the degree or extent of difference of the quality under consideration, in the things compared, and there is less room for pleasing epithets or striking figures. What is sought for is a word which will express the degree of difference, and to this purpose the adverbs of quantity or extent are best suited. As thus used these adverbs are felt in their literal sense, as adverbs expressing quantity, rather than as general strengthening particles. *Vil baz*, *micheel baz*, mean *better by much*, *verre baz*, or *witen baz*, *better by far*.

VIL.

The most frequent strengthener of comparatives during this period is *vil*, which undoubtedly continued in use down to modern times. Examples of this particle are so numerous in the literature of the period that none need here be cited.

MICHEL.

Next to *vil*, *micheel* is the most frequent strengthener of comparatives. This particle appears both as an accusative, and as a genitive of measure. The two forms are about equally frequent, and there seems to be no rule as to which is preferable in any given connection. Both often appear in the same text. Sometimes this is merely a matter of editing, though manuscript confusion is also present.

Examples of *micheel* with the following comparatives have been noticed : *mêr* 8 times, *baz* 3, *bezzere* 2, *harter*, Iwein, 2906 ; *lieber*, Pred. aus S. Paul 134-12 ; *grôzzier*, Liet v. Troye 3711 ; *gerner*,

Nib. 2112-2; *heiliger*, Pred. aus St. Paul 132-26; *sanfter*, Nib. 1429-2 II; *vaster*, Str. Alex. 4553; *wunderlîcher*, Pred. aus S. Paul 25-9.

Michels occurs with: *mêr*, 11 times, *baz* 3, *wirs*, Bert. v. Reg. I 117-35; Liet v. Troye 3529; *gerner*, Bar. u. Jos. 136-26; Freid. Bescheid. 59-11; *bezzet*, Berth. v. Reg. I 152-23; *harter*, Iwein 4391; *elter*, Freid. Bescheid. 79-5; *lieber*, Freid. Bescheid. 56-2.

VERRE.

Verre with comparatives is nearly as frequent as *Michel*. The following examples have been noted: *verre baz*, 21 times, *bezzet* 4, *lieber* 4, *höher* 2, *schoener* 2, *gerner*, Heil. Geo. 5353; *klarer*, Erlös. 1258; *linder*, Heil. Geo. 3068; *mêr*, Berth. v. Reg. 62-34; *nêher*, Renner 1761; *richer*, Heil. Geo. 5320; *sanfter*, Garel 2476; *swarzir*, Ath. u. Pro. B85; *ungelîcher*, Berth. v. Reg. I 103-37; *unschedelîcher*, Berth. v. Reg. I 21-6.

MANEGES.

Maneges is found with comparatives in Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan*, as follows: *maneges bezzet*, 1004; *maneges enger*, 1474; *maneges wirs*, 17844.

GAR.

Gar with comparatives occurs: *gar bezzet*, Parz. 19119; *gar schierer*, Rosengarten, 266-4.

GENUOC.

Genuoc baz occurs in *Parzival*, 486-16.

WÎTEN.

Witen mêre is found in *Jüngere Judith*, 156-27.

SUMMARY BY DIALECTS.

A brief review of the previous material, giving the conditions during this period by dialects, will now be in place.

ALEMANNIC.

Throughout the whole period, *vil* is the predominant strengthening particle. Signs of its decline are evident however toward the close of the thirteenth century, and these are more marked in Upper than in Lower Alemannic. *Harte* is frequent in Lower Alemannic monuments at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and gradually goes out of use during the remainder of the period, first in prose and lyric poetry, then in the epic. In Upper Alemannic it disappears earlier than elsewhere. *Gar* is known by the beginning of the thirteenth century, and gradually increases in frequency throughout the period, becoming more popular in Upper than in Lower Alemannic. *Sére* is found in Gottfried's *Tristan* and other Lower Alemannic epics of the early thirteenth century, but disappears from the literature shortly after. *Genuoc* and *wol* are used infrequently during the first half of the century, and are practically unknown during the latter half. *Rehte* is rare throughout the whole period.

BAVARIAN-AUSTRIAN.

In the Bavarian-Austrian poetical monuments *vil* likewise remains the predominant strengthening particle throughout the period. In the spoken dialect of Bavaria, as indicated by the sermons of Berthold von Regensburg, it gives way to *gar* during the latter half of the thirteenth century. In Austria it doubtless maintained its supremacy even in the popular dialect until the end of the period. *Gar* is found very early in Bavarian, where it rapidly comes into prominence. It becomes also very popular in the Tyrol during the last quarter of the century. In Austria it is scarcely known to the popular dialect until the end of the period. *Harte* is popular in Austria at the beginning of

the thirteenth century and continues until late. It is less popular in Bavaria, except possibly in the north, and disappears from the prose literature very early. *Wol* and *rehte* are infrequently found, the former during the early part, the latter throughout the whole period. *Grimme* and *starke* are known to the popular literature of Austria at the beginning of the thirteenth century, but soon disappear. *Genuoc* is rare throughout the whole period, in prose as well as poetical monuments.

SWABIAN.

In the poetical monuments of Swabia, *vil* is the most common of all the particles, and shows no general decline before the end of the thirteenth century. In the spoken dialect, particularly of the southern part, as indicated by the works of David von Augsburg, it gives way to *gar* during the latter part of the century. *Harte* is common in the later works of Hartmann von Aue, occurring infrequently elsewhere. It was probably never popular in the spoken language and disappeared early. *Gar* is found in the works of Hartmann and increases in popularity throughout the period. *Rehte* and *wol* are infrequently found throughout the whole period. *Genuoc* is known to the literary language at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and is more freely used by Hartmann, i. e., outside of rime position, than by any other Middle High German author.

SOUTH AND EAST FRANKISH.

In South and East Frankish the conditions are apparently not different from those of the neighboring dialects. The evidence all points to the late continuance of *vil* and *harte*, the former being predominant until the end of the period, and the late appearance of *gar*. *Rehte*, *wol*, and *genuoc* take an unimportant part, appearing in the poetical monuments only rarely.

WEST MIDDLE GERMAN.

In West Middle German *vil* is the predominant strengthening particle in the literature of the twelfth century but gives way,

at least in Hessian, to *harte* at the beginning of the thirteenth. *Harte* is quite freely used in the twelfth century, and becomes the predominant particle in one monument (Liet von Troye) early in the thirteenth. It then declines rapidly in the epic monuments and *gar* takes its place. No reliable traces of *gar* are found until the end of the twelfth century, from which time it gradually increases in frequency until it outnumbers all other particles at the end of the century. *Wol* here is rare until the latter part of the period, occurring most frequently in Elisabeth. *Rehte* and *genuoc* are rare throughout the whole period.

THURINGIAN.

In Thuringian the decline of *vil* is not so early as in Hessian. Before the end of the thirteenth century, however, it gives way to *gar*. *Harte* is here also quite freely used at the beginning of the thirteenth century, though in none of the monuments examined is it more frequent than *vil*. It declines rapidly throughout the latter half of the century, disappearing first in lyrical poetry (Heinrich von Morungen, Heinrich von Meissen). *Gar* is found in lyric poetry at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and gradually increases in frequency until the end, when it appears as the predominant particle.

STRENGTHENING PARTICLES IN THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF LITERATURE.

In the foregoing discussions several things have been assumed concerning the different classes of literature, and their relation to each other in the matter of diction. This was for the purpose of locating, if possible, the different usages as to strengthening particles on the MHG field. It will here be in order to state in a more connected way, what has already been either directly referred to or taken for granted, and show what bearing the study of these particles may have on the subject.

An important question, when a given expression is found in any monument, and especially in the case of a word used as a general strengthening particle, is, where did it come from, or

where is it at home? The difficulties in the way of answering such a question are in many instances formidable. The greater part of the literature of this period is poetical, and shows a style and diction more or less removed from that of the spoken dialect. When a certain expression, therefore, is found in a monument of this kind, the first thing to be determined is whether it is there because it is current in the spoken language of that part of the country in which the monument originated, or whether it is merely a part of conventional literary usage, handed down it may be by general literary tradition. What in one monument may be a mark of local dialectical coloring, may be the direct opposite in another, and indicate a tendency on the part of the author to sacrifice local usage and conform to a supposed classical standard.

Of the different forms of literature of this period the religious prose may be considered the nearest, in the matter of diction, to the popular dialect. Its purpose is to appeal to the people, and in it, if anywhere, words and expressions which are actually current may be expected to appear. Even here however phrases and formulas would often find lodgement and remain long after they had disappeared elsewhere, and this might apply to a class of expressions as unconscious in their use as strengthening particles.

Next to the prose monuments, the best place to look for hints as to local usage would be lyrical poetry, or the early popular epic. Lyrical diction, though marked during this period by a certain conventionality, is in general much nearer the current spoken dialect than the diction of epic poetry. This class of literature responds more readily to popular taste and fashion. Expressions are introduced more easily from the popular speech, and forms which have gone out of general use are not retained so long as in the epic.

The popular epic, especially in its earlier stages of development, that is, before it was overshadowed by the foreign or court epic, would also reflect with considerable accuracy the word usage of the current spoken dialect. The element of local color is here strong, and although this class of literature is largely conservative, and develops a standard and tradition of its own,

this tradition is based in the first place no doubt upon current local usage.

The farthest removed, in the matter of diction, from the current popular speech, is the court epic. This comes in part from an effort to write in a language free from dialectical peculiarities and suited to the cultured classes of all parts of the country, partly from the direct influence of one literary work upon another. The court epic, after having once set up a standard of word usage, is the most conservative of all forms of literature. Expressions and formulas once in fashion, continue here long after they have become obsolete in the spoken language, or even if they have never been actually current there at all. The results of direct imitation of the older and more famous works are plainest in the monuments of the middle and latter part of the thirteenth century, where expressions and formulas from the writers which by this time have become classical, are carried along in the epic diction and curiously intermingled with similar phrases fresh from the current language of the people. This is equally true of the later popular epic. By this time the foreign epics had become well known and very popular, and the chances for the success of a native German legend were all the greater if it contained frequent allusions to the works of such famous writers as Hartmann or Wolfram.

This relation between the various forms of literature of this period is shown very clearly in the use of the different strengthening particles. During the period under consideration, *vil* and *harte* are both in process of becoming obsolete. The former, as has already been shown, shows the first signs of decline in the prose monuments and lyric poetry, and remains longest of all in the epic. *Harte* is found very rarely in prose and in the lyrics during the period, but remains in the epic until the fourteenth century. In the early Austrian popular epic it is there as a part of general popular diction, in the later epic it remains as a part of traditional usage for this class of literature. *Gar*, on the other hand, which at this time is just coming into prominence, appears first and strongest in the prose monuments and in lyric poetry, but makes its way into epic poetry but slowly. Not being current in certain parts of the Austrian field during

the first half of the thirteenth century, it did not enter into the early popular epic of this dialect, and its presence in the later popular literature is due to outside literary influence. When this particle is found in any of the early monuments from the other parts of the MHG field, however, there can be no question as to where it comes from. Unlike *harte* and *vil*, *gar* is not yet a part of the traditional literary language, and if used at all, it must be as a part of the poet's own dialect. *Rehte*, during this period, as likewise for Modern German, although a polite expression, has a decidedly popular color. With few exceptions, the monuments showing the highest percentage for this particle are lyrical, next in order comes the popular epic, while the formal court epic shows the lowest of all.

The history of the different strengthening particles, as traced in the foregoing pages, shows that they originate in the popular dialect, and are taken up into the different classes of literature with varying degrees of readiness. After the prose literature, they appear first and strongest in lyric poetry, and, for the early period, the popular epic, the fully developed court epic being the least ready of all to take up a new expression of this kind. Before any recognized standard of form or diction had been developed, the foreign or court epic, as well as the early popular literature, would show to a certain extent current local usage as to these particles. Even here however the feeling that the work was written for a wide circle of hearers, and for the higher classes of society, would prevent the use of any expression of this kind that was distinctly provincial, or that was not well known over the country.

When such expressions become obsolete, they disappear first in the prose literature and lyric poetry, and remain longest of all in the epic. They constitute there a part of what is distinctly poetic diction, dignified because it is old and quaint, and pleasing because it furnishes a bond of connection with the literature of the past.



BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

I was born in Trumbull County, Ohio, April 8, 1869. Removing to Illinois and later to Iowa, I received my preparatory education in the high school at Gladbrook in the latter State. After a few years spent in teaching, I entered Cornell College in 1892, graduating in the philosophical course there four years later. I served then for two years as principal of the township high school at Fairfax, Iowa, and in 1898 came to Baltimore to pursue advanced courses in German, French, and History at the Johns Hopkins University. In January 1900 I was awarded a University scholarship, and during the year 1900-1901 I held the fellowship in German.

At this University I attended courses under Prof. Adams and Dr. Ballagh in History, Drs. Armstrong, Rambeau, Ogden, Wilson, and Brush, in French, and Professor Wood, Associate Professor Vos, and Dr. Baker, in German. To all of these I wish to express my hearty appreciation of the many favors they have shown. I am under especial obligations to Professor Wood, whose lectures and seminary courses have inspired a love for the study of literature, and to Associate Professor Vos, whose helpful criticism and advice have made this study in the older German field possible.





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY

Due two weeks after date.

351 8 1923

30m-7,'12

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C043505970

127174

